DR. ROSS AND BISHOP COLENSO:

OR

THE TRUTH RESTORED

IN REGARD TO

POLYGAMY AND SLAVERY:

BY

THE REV. FREDERICK A. ROSS, D. D.,
OF HUNTSVILLE, ALABAMA,

AND

THE RIGHT REV. JOHN WILLIAM COLENSO, D. D.,
LORD BISHOP OF NATAL.

PHILADELPHIA:
PUBLISHED BY HENRY B. ASHMEAD,
GEORGE STREET ABOVE ELEVENTH.
1857.

The two works which lie at the foundation of this publication are the following:

"Slavery ordained of God. By Rev. Frederick A. Ross, D. D., Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Huntsville, Alabama. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1857." pp. 186.

"Remarks on the Proper Treatment of Cases of Polygamy, as found already existing in Converts from Heathenism. By John William Colenso, D. D., Lord Bishop of Natal. Printed by May & Davis, Church street, Pietermaritzburg, [Africa,] 1855." pp. 27.

The latter of these works, as being in the hands of few persons in this country, is printed entire. From the former, as having had a somewhat extensive circulation, and as being easily accessible, only such extracts have been made, with accompanying remarks, as to present the substance of the arguments of Dr. Ross in favor of slavery; to illustrate the coincidence of these arguments with those of Bishop Colenso in favor of Polygamy; and to show that the arguments on these kindred subjects impart and derive mutual strength by being brought together.

137870

POLYGAMY AND SLAVERY.

The Bible is a book written in a remote age, and in languages which have long since ceased to be spoken in the world. It was penned among a people comparatively rude; with little literature except that which is found in their own sacred writings, and with little or no science; in a land where the prevailing institutions, habits and opinions, were exceedingly unlike those of modern times; with no apparent anticipation on the part of the writers that the productions of their pens would be subjected to the rigid scrutiny of enlightened future ages, and no underlying idea that the doctrines and laws of the book would ever need to be *adjusted* to institutions and opinions which would spring up in far distant ages, and in lands of whose existence these writers never dreamed.

It has come down to us *through* the darkest ages of the world, and has brought along with itself many of the opinions of those ages on moral subjects, and many of the interpretations which were affixed to it in those times. There is nothing more difficult to remove than interpretations long affixed to any book; and especially if those interpretations become incorporated with

religious doctrines. The interpretation and the doctrine become, in popular estimation, identified, and the one is regarded as being as sacred as the other. They are alike sanctioned by immemorial belief; they become a part of the creed of the church; they are upheld by all the authority of Synods and Councils; they enter into the literature of those times, and constitute a part of the history of the world; they are venerated for their antiquity; they are loved as truths that have guided millions to a better world—that have sustained the saint on the bed of death, and comforted martyrs amidst the flames. It should be added, also, that those opinions may become the basis on which the superstructure of a powerful hierarchy has been reared, and the very props of a religion that has secured a universal ascendancy over mankind. To detach the interpretation, therefore, from the book is to undermine the foundation of the edifice:—and in the apprehension that this may be so, all the real love of truth in the church, and all the affected zeal of an interested hierarchy will be aroused; all that there is of love for the venerable, the ancient, the pious, the holy—all the attachments to the system formed from interest, from the love of power, or from the hope of heaven, will be quickened into life.

Accordingly, in the history of religion, nothing has been found to be more difficult, if not more hopeless, than to *detach* false interpretations from the Bible; there is nothing which is more likely to involve men in peril than the attempt to substitute a new and more rational interpretation in the place of one that has been hallowed for ages.

It is well known, that in the views which prevail-

ed in former ages in regard to the structure of the earth, it became a most difficult thing to separate these views from the prevailing interpretation of the Bible; and for any one to entertain contrary views was regarded not merely as an error in science, but as a much more vital matter—a heresy in the church. The prevailing views in regard to astronomy and geography became identified with the doctrines of the church, and to promulgate a doctrine on those subjects at variance with what the Bible was supposed to teach, was regarded as justifying the extremest forms of persecution for heresy. In a council of clergymen that met in Salamanca in 1486, to examine and test the views of Christopher Columbus, a considerable portion held it to be grossly heterodox to believe that by sailing Westward the Eastern parts of the world could be reached. No one, it was held, could entertain such a view without also believing that there were "antipodes," and that the world was round, not flat:—errors denounced not only by great theologians of the golden age of ecclesiastical learning, such as Lactantius and St. Augustine, but also directly opposed, it was alleged, to the very letter of Scripture. "They observed," says Washington Irving, "that in the Psalms the heavens are said to be extended like a hide,—that is, according to commentators, the curtain or covering of a tent, which among the ancient pastoral nations was formed of the hides of animals; and that St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Hebrews, compares the heavens to a tabernacle or tent extended over the earth, which they thence inferred to be flat."*

Thus, also, it was in the well-known case of Galileo.

* Life of Columbus.

The doctrine which he was required by the Church, to "abjure, curse, and detest," and which "he was never again to teach, because erroneous, heretical, *and contrary to Scripture*," was the doctrine of the earth's motion and the sun's stability. The doctrine derived by the Church from the Bible—a doctrine which had become as sacred as any other doctrine held by the Church—was, that the earth is the centre of the system, and that all the heavenly bodies revolve around it; and it seemed no less difficult to separate that doctrine from the teachings of the Bible, than it would have been to detach from it the doctrine of the Fall of Man, or the doctrine of the Trinity. So Voetius, a celebrated Dutch theologian of the seventeenth century, says, "This we affirm, that is, that the earth rests, and the sun moves daily round it, with all divines, natural philosophers, Jews and Mahommedans, Greeks and Latins, excepting one or two of the ancients, and the modern followers of Copernicus."

To show with what tenacity an interpretation of Scripture that has been received for ages as the true one is adhered to, and how difficult it is to detach such an interpretation, however absurd or erroneous from the Bible, it may be proper to refer to an argument of Turretin. He is arguing, "in opposition to certain philosophers," in behalf of the Ptolemaic doctrine that the sun moves in the heavens and revolves around the earth, while the earth itself remains at rest in the midst. "*First*," he remarks, "the sun is said in Scripture to move in the heavens, and to rise and set. 'The sun is as a bridegroom coming out of his chambers, and rejoiceth as a strong man to run a race.' 'The sun knoweth his

going down.' 'The sun also ariseth, and the sun goeth down.' *Secondly.* The sun by a miracle stood still in the time of Joshua, and by a miracle it went back in the time of Hezekiah. *Thirdly.* The earth is said to be fixed immovably. 'The earth is also established that it cannot be moved.' 'Thou hast established the earth, and it abideth.' 'They continue this day according to their ordinance.' *Fourthly.* Neither could birds, which often fly off through an hour's circuit, be able to return to their nests. *Fifthly.* Whatever flies or is suspended in the air, ought by this theory, to move from west to east, but this is proved not to be true, from birds, arrows shot forth, atoms made manifest in the sun, and down floating in the atmosphere."

From reasoning such as this, one of the most accomplished theologians of his age, and that age not a remote one; one who lived after Tycho Brahe, Kepler and Galileo had finished their labors; one who lived in the time of Isaac Newton—for when the work containing these sentiments was issued from the press, (1695,) Newton had attained his fifty third year; one whose system of theology has been long used as a text-book in the Princeton Theological Seminary, and whose views have been regarded as the standard in training men for the ministry in the nineteenth century,—set himself against the most remarkable discoveries of his age or of any age. It is not wonderful, therefore, that old interpretations of the Bible, though founded in error, yet long retain their hold on the public mind, even amidst the light of a very advanced age of the world.

It has long been an opinion extensively held in the world, that the Bible is adverse to slavery and polygamy.

In reference to slavery, it has been supposed that there were many precepts in the New Testament particularly, which are entirely hostile to the system, and which, by their fair application would tend to remove slavery from the world. It has been believed that the Bible teaches the doctrine that all men are so far equal as to be entitled to liberty; that although slavery was *tolerated* in the Old Testament, it was not *sanctioned* there as a permanent institution; and that, under the influence of the Bible, a period would arrive when it would cease. From the prevalence of this opinion, as it was held by the early church, much was done to remove slavery from the Roman empire:—for the fact of that removal can be distinctly traced to what was supposed to be the doctrine of the New Testament in regard to the natural equality of man and to human rights.*

It was under the influence of these views that Wilberforce and Clarkson undertook to convince the world that the slave-trade was wrong, and so to set forth the evils of slavery as to secure universal emancipation; and it was under the influence of these views that that unhappy measure was resorted to—the emancipation of the slaves in the British West Indies—a measure which has been so disastrous to agriculture and commerce, and to the happiness alike of the whites and colored race in those islands.†

These views also have been substantially held by many of the most illustrious men of this Republic.

* Particularly of such passages as the following: Acts xx. 26, Matt. vii. 12, Col. iv. 1, 1 Cor. vii. 21, Gal. iii. 28.

† "JAMAICA IS DESTROYED."—Dr. Ross, p. 72. The capitals are his. "The British West Indies," says Mr. Calhoun, in similar language, "are *ruined, impoverished, miserable, wretched,* and *destined to be abandoned to the black race.*"—*Works,* vol. vi. p. 310.

They were the views entertained by Jefferson, Jay, Madison; by John Hancock, and by Samuel and John Adams; by Patrick Henry, and by Washington.

These views had taken so firm a hold on the American mind that they were substantially incorporated into the Declaration of Independence,* and it was supposed that they were destined to be co-extensive with every just notion of liberty. This was becoming the prevailing conviction alike at the South and the North. A very large portion of the people of this land believed that these views were in accordance with the Bible, and the progress of this opinion was rapidly tending to sweep away the true doctrine in regard to the natural inequality of men as God has made them, and the necessity of due subordination in the different ranks of society, and was thus tending to interfere dangerously with the domestic institutions alike of the North and the South. That these views were acquiring an alarming prevalence, and were likely to extend still further, is admitted and deplored by Dr. Ross.

The Rev. Mr. Barnes, to whom Dr. Ross's Letters were addressed, had said, in the work to which Dr. Ross responds,† "The present is eminently a time when the

* Dr. Ross, however, has shown that the doctrines of the Declaration of Independence, that "all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," are altogether false, having their foundation in infidelity, and being dangerous to the liberties of mankind. "All this," says he, "every word of it—every jot and tittle—is the liberty and equality claimed by infidelity. God has cursed it seven times in France since 1793, and he will curse it seventy times seven, if Frenchmen prefer to be pestled so often in Solomon's mortar."—p. 105. "That paragraph," referring to the introduction to the Declaration of Independence, "is an *excrescence* on the tree of liberty."—Ibid. See the argument in full on pp. 121–139.

† The Church and Slavery.

views of every man on the subject of slavery should be uttered in unambiguous tones." On this Dr. Ross remarks:

"If the Bible does sanction the system, [of slavery,] then that 'unambiguous tone' will silence abolitionists who admit the Scriptures; it will satisfy all good men, and give peace to the country. That is the '*tone*' I want men to hear. Listen to it in the past and present speech of Providence. *The time was when you had the very public sentiment you are now trying to form. From Maine to Louisiana, the American mind was softly yielding to the impress of emancipation,* in some hope, however vague and imaginary. SOUTHERN, *as well as Northern men in the church and out of it,* NOT HAVING SUFFICIENTLY STUDIED THE WORD OF GOD, *and, under our own and* FRENCH *revolutionary excitement, looking only at the evils of slavery, wished it away from the land.* It was a MISTAKEN public sentiment. Yet such as it was, *you had it,* and it was doing your work."—pp. 95, 96.

By a closer study of the Scriptures, however, and of the true principles of liberty, it has been found that the views which had been so long entertained in the Christian Church, and which were so fast gaining ground in our own country, were wholly erroneous, and it was important for the true interests of the African race, for the peace and prosperity of the country, and for the best influences of religion on the master and the slave, that a check should be put to these sentiments, and that the views of men should be brought more into conformity with the teachings of the Bible. This process of thought and the result, is thus stated by Dr. Ross:

"Meanwhile, many of your most pious men, soundest scholars, and sagacious observers of providence, have been led to study the Bible more faithfully in the light of the times, and they are reading it more and more in harmony with the views which have been reached by the highest Southern minds, to wit: That the relation of

master and slave is sanctioned by the Bible;—that it is a relation belonging to the same category as those of husband and wife, parent and child, master and apprentice, master and hireling;—that the relations of husband and wife, parent and child, *were ordained in Eden, for man, as man,* and *modified after the fall,* while the relation of slavery, as a system of labor, is *only one form of the government ordained of God over fallen and degraded man;*—that the *evils* in the system are *the same evils* of OPPRESSION we see in the relation of husband and wife, and all other forms of government;—that slavery, as a relation, suited to the more degraded or the more ignorant and helpless types of a sunken humanity, is, like all government, intended *as the proof of the curse of such degradation, and at the same time to elevate and bless;*—that the relation of husband and wife, being for man, as man, *will ever be over him,* while slavery will remain so long as God sees it best, as a controlling power over the ignorant, and the more degraded and helpless; and that, when he sees it for the good of the country, he will cause it to pass away, if the slave can be elevated to liberty and equality, political and social, with his master, *in* that country; or *out* of that country, if such elevation cannot be given therein, but may be realized in some other land: all which result must be left to the unfoldings of the divine will, *in harmony with the Bible,* and not to a newly-discovered dispensation. These facts are vindicated in the Bible and Providence."

"The Southern slave-holder is now satisfied, as never before, that the relation of master and slave is sanctioned by the Bible."

"I rejoice that the sober sense North and South, so strangely asleep and silent, has risen up to hear the word of God and to speak it to the land. I rejoice that all the South now know that God gives the right to hold slaves, and, with that right, obligations they must fulfill. I rejoice that the day has dawned in which the North and South will think and feel and act together on the subject of slavery."—pp. 98, 99, 100, 101, 103.

It is not improbable that the world owes the first suggestion of these views, as now held by Dr. Ross and by so many Christians at the South as well as at the North, to that eminent statesman, the late John C. Calhoun.

His great mind was early turned to this subject, and he brought all his vast powers to bear upon it, not only as connected with the prosperity of the State of South Carolina, and the condition of the South generally, but in reference also to the true character and destiny of the African race. The doctrine held by him was substantially the same as that now held by Dr. Ross—that the African race is in a degraded condition in their own country; that they are incapable of rising by themselves; that it is necessary in order to their elevation that they should be brought into an intimate relation to a more elevated and enlightened race; that the best form in which this can be done is that of servants or slaves under the control of a superior race; that the climate of the South is not adapted to the white man as a place of toil; that labor in the production of cotton, rice, and sugar, can be best performed by the African, inured always to that climate; that the character of the African is such that it is best for him to be at present in a state of dependence, and that, in this condition, it may be hoped that he will ultimately rise to a higher elevation than he could in his native land; that this has been demonstrated in the undoubted fact that those now held in slavery are in a much more elevated condition than their own ancestors were in Africa, or than the various tribes of the African race are now in their own land. The existence of slavery, therefore, is not only essential to the development of the resources of this country, but is to be the medium by which the African is to rise to a more elevated condition than he could ever hope to attain in his own country.

These views are thus stated by Mr. Calhoun himself:

"He who regards slavery in these States simply under the relation of master and slave, as important as that relation is, viewed merely as a question of property to the slaveholding section of the Union, has a very imperfect conception of the institution, and the impossibility of abolishing it without disasters unexampled in the history of the world. To understand its nature and importance fully, it must be borne in mind that slavery as it exists in the Southern States, (including under the Southern, all the slaveholding States,) involves not only the political relation of the master and slave, but also the social and political relations of the two races, of nearly equal numbers, from different quarters of the globe, and the most opposite of all others in every particular that distinguishes one race from another. Emancipation would destroy these relations,—would divest the masters of their property, and subvert the relation, social and political, that has existed between the races from almost the first settlement of the Southern States."—*Works*, vol. v. p. 203.

"Under this relation the two races have long lived in peace and prosperity, and, if not disturbed, would long continue so to live. While the European race has rapidly increased in wealth and numbers, and, at the same time, has maintained an equality, at least morally and intellectually, with their brethren of the non-slaveholding States, the African race has multiplied with not less rapidity, *accompanied by great improvement, physically and intellectually, and a degree of comfort which the laboring classes of few other countries enjoy, and confedssely greatly superior to what the free people of the same race possess in the non-slaveholding States. It may, indeed, be safely asserted, that there is no example in history in which a savage people, such as their ancestors were when brought to this country, have ever advanced in the same period so rapidly in numbers and improvement.*

"To destroy the existing relations, would be to destroy this prosperity, and to place the two races in a state of conflict, which must end in the expulsion or extirpation of one or the other. No other can be substituted compatible with their peace or security. The difficulty is in the diversity of the races. So strongly drawn is the line between the two in consequence, and so strengthened by the force of habit and education, that *it is impossible for*

them to exist together in the same community, where their numbers are so nearly equal as in the slaveholding States, under any other relation than that which now exists. Social and political equality among them is impossible. No power on earth can remove this difficulty."—*Works*, vol. v. pp. 204, 205.

Again Mr. Calhoun says:

"To destroy the existing relation between the free and servile races of the South would lead to consequences unparalleled in history. They cannot be separated and live together in peace, in harmony, or to their mutual advantage, *except in their present relation.* Under any other, wretchedness, and misery, and desolation would spread over the whole South."—*Works*, vol. vi. p. 309.

It is not improbable, that even in the mind of Mr. Calhoun, these views had their origin in his familiarity with the best writings of the ancients; that he desired simply to re-produce in our country what had been found to be conducive to the best condition of society in the most elevated and refined states of antiquity, and that in fact, the doctrines which he suggested, and which are beginning to prevail so extensively at the South, are to be traced ultimately to the views of domestic life which placed the Greeks, particularly the Athenians, at the head of the ancient world, and which contributed to make Athens the model of a republic. Mr. Calhoun's mind was not only one of extraordinary native power, but was cultivated in the highest degree. In early life his familiarity with ancient literature had probably suggested to him those views which he afterwards developed and defended, as embodying the best results of human reasoning and experience as to what will most conduce to the welfare of a state. It is certain that, in this re-

spect, his views accord remarkably with those which had been advanced by Plato and Aristotle, and which were at the basis of the ideas entertained in Greece, of what contributes to the perfection of a commonwealth. Those views lay at the foundation of all that made Athens refined in social life, and great in arts, in poetry, in eloquence.

It is well remarked in the Westminster Review, that

"Although the earliest asserters and organizers of democracy, the Greeks were essentially an aristocratic people, cherishing and aiming to realize institutions favorable to noble manners, high-breeding, refined humanity; favorable, in fact, to the rearing of what we call 'the gentleman.' They also valued not numbers but quality. And it was by quality, in singular disproportion to numbers, that they inprinted their image on history and effected their lasting influence with mankind. Athens counted but 30,000 citizens. The whole Athenian State was not larger than Yorkshire. 'The excellence of a commonwealth,' says Aristotle, 'is not to be estimated by its populousness or extent, but by its fitness for performing its proper functions. *Hippocrates was a greater physician than many physicians twice his size.* Slaves' (that is, the laboring and 'meaner' class generally,) 'sojourners and strangers render a city populous, but do not make it *great.*'* Plato, in his ideal state, treats the community at large merely as the platform and soil for the raising of a superior class: the rulers or guardians, highest specimens of the genus man.. These, from infancy onwards, receive the most thoughtful and minutely considered education; they are nurtured in grand sentiments; guarded against all disturbing influences: gymnastics and music must awaken and ripen their physical and intellectual faculties. But this select class was deprived of personal enjoyments; they are not allowed to possess property, or even to use money; private family-life was forbidden to them; and they could not so much as travel in their own affairs. 'Should it be objected,' says Plato, 'that by these privations they must enjoy less happiness than the other citizens,

* Aristotle, "Politics," b. iv. ch. 4.

we will reply, that a legislator ought to propose to himself the happiness of a whole society, and not that of any single class of citizens of which it is composed.'

"This ruling class on the summit was balanced by a drudging slave-class at the base of the social edifice. The aim was not, nor did it profess to be, justice tempered with mercy to every brother man, but it was symmetry, beauty in the *whole*. 'The whole is before the parts,' says Aristotle, also; 'so equally is the state before the citizen. The parts are there for the sake of the whole; the hand for the sake of the man, so also the citizen for the sake of the state. And the noblest must rule, whether the others consent to it or not; '*otherwise they would allow to Zeus himself,' if he should come to live amongst them, but equal rights with themselves.*' "—*Westminster Review, July* 1857, pp. 8, 9.

The aim in the Athenian commonwealth, was to make as much as possible, every citizen a "gentleman," a "man of leisure, devoted to public affairs, and to the culture of refined taste:"—an object which has been sought so universally at the South in our own country, and which has been reached so much more generally there than at the North; an object which can be secured only in connection with slavery, where, from the nature of the case, one portion of the community, relieved from the necessity of drudgery and toil, will have leisure to devote time and talent to "public affairs, and to the culture of refined tastes."

"It is plain," says Aristotle, "that a life of mechanical drudgery, or a life of haggling commerce, is totally incompatible with that dignified life which it is our wish that our citizens should lead, and totally adverse to that generous elevation of mind with which it is our ambition to inspire them. The mere trade of husbandry, the assiduous labor and minute attention which it requires, would be destructive of that secure leisure which is essential to the formation of their characters; and such

sordid cares would impede and obstruct the generous and manly exertions by which virtue is displayed and confirmed. Men habitually addicted to the lowly pursuits of providing necessaries and accumulating gain, are unfit members of our republic, because they are incapable of relishing those enjoyments in which we have supposed its chief happiness to consist."*

"They," (the men occupied with providing necessaries, says he, in continuation of the passage just cited,) "they are to be classed with things necessary to the Commonwealth, but not to be ranked with its citizens.† For the best and most perfect Commonwealth must provide for the happiness of all its members, and a Commonwealth founded on virtue cannot provide for the happiness of men who are but feebly touched by her charms. Such men, therefore, though necessary to a Commonwealth, are not parts of the Commonwealth, any more than food, though necessary to an animal, is part of an animal; or that the instruments employed in producing any work, are themselves part of that work."

The indispensable condition of reaching this elevation in society, according to Aristotle, is *slavery*—the very view which was suggested by Mr. Calhoun, and which is becoming a prevailing doctrine in our country.

"Cities or commonwealths," says Aristotle, ("Politics," b. iv. c. 91,) "are composed of families.....A FAMILY TO BE COMPLETE MUST CONSIST OF FREEMEN AND SLAVES."

The doctrine, also, as laid down by Mr. Calhoun, and defended by Dr. Ross, was that on which the views of Aristotle and Plato were founded—that slavery is essentially a *form of government*, and that the great rule in regard to government is, that the most wise, powerful, and enlightened must command; that "SOME

* Aristotle, "Politics," b. iv. ch. 9.

† The very doctrine of the Supreme Court of the United States, as decided in the case of Dred Scott.

ARE FORMED TO COMMAND, AND OTHERS TO OBEY;" and that there is a class who are "naturally slaves, because it is their interest to be so." Thus Aristotle says:

"Government and subjection are things useful and necessary; they prevail everywhere, in animated as well as in brute matter; *from their first origin, some natures are formed to command, and others to obey;* the kinds of government and subjection varying with the differences of their objects, but all equally useful for their respective ends; and those kinds the best and most excellent, from which the best and most excellent consequences result. In every composition whose parts are harmonized into any regular whole, the necessity of government and subjection evidently appears, whether this whole or system be continuous or discrete, animated or lifeless. Even in music, &c." . . . . . "In compositions endowed with life, it is the province of mind to command, and the province of matter to obey. Man consists of soul and body, and in all men rightly constituted, the soul commands the body; although some men are so grossly depraved, that in them the body seems to command the soul. But here the order of nature is perverted." . . "The same observations apply to the various tribes of animals, &c., which are all of them benefited by their subjection to man, because this is conducive to their safety. In the different sexes, also, we see the male formed for government, and the female for submission;" (*hah!*) "and a principle prevailing thus universally in every region of nature, cannot but apply to an institution so natural as is that of political society."

"Those men, therefore," he continues, "those men whose powers are chiefly confined to the body, and whose principal excellence consists in affording bodily service, *those, I say, are naturally slaves, because it is their interest to be so.* They can obey reason, though they are unable to exercise it; and though different from tame animals, who are disciplined by means merely of their sensations and appetites, *they perform nearly the same tasks, and become the property of other men, because their own safety requires it.*"*

* Aristotle, "Politics," b. i. ch. 3.

It will be seen in the course of these remarks how remarkably this language accords with the language of Dr. Ross.

The views which were entertained by Plato and Aristotle, and which are so prevalent in our own country, were long since also suggested to Xenophon. Thus he says:

"Manual occupations are dishonorable and unworthy of a citizen; most of them disfigure the body. They oblige a man to sit in the shade or by the fire. They leave no time, neither for the republic nor for friends."

And again, speaking of mechanics and manufacturers:

"What is one to do with people who mostly sit all day long, nailed to their frames, and whose produce enervate the consumers, and only cause us to spend money."

So Plato remarks:

"Nature has of itself made neither shoemaker nor blacksmith; such occupations degrade those who exercise them; vile mercenaries, whose trade excludes them from political rights."

It is probable that Mr. Calhoun in the views which he entertained of slavery, looked at the subject mainly from a *political* point of view, with no immediate and direct reference to the *religious* character and destiny of the African race. Eminent as he was, he was chiefly distinguished as a statesman, and his great powers were called forth rather with reference to the civil than to the religious glory of his country;—rather to their bearing on our nation's greatness, than to the elevation of any of the degraded portions of mankind to a more correct knowledge of God and of the way of salvation.

The doctrine suggested by Mr. Calhoun, however,

was susceptible of an application which he did not perceive, or to which he did not particularly turn his attention, in leading to the best means of imparting the blessings of the gospel to the sunken and degraded portions of mankind. To Christian minds it could not but suggest the question, whether the design of Providence was not, in fact, to bring so large a portion of the African race into close connection with a more elevated race, *in order* that they might, in virtue of such a connection, be made acquainted with the great truths of Christianity; that they might be placed under the influence of Christian masters, furnishing a daily illustration of the truth and power of religion in the most tender relations of life; that they might be trained in the midst of Christian institutions, far away from the associations and allurements of a most degraded heathenism; and that thus, while, by removal from their own land, they would become emancipated from heathen influences, they might be placed where, by daily exhibitions of the true nature of religion they would gradually be elevated, and become ultimately fitted for the enjoyment of rational and intelligent liberty. In this view of the matter, the subject has an aspect of the widest benevolence, and connects itself, not merely with polished manners, and with national wealth, but with the great operations of Christian charity of this age. Some of the best minds, therefore, at the South and the North—the true friends of religion, ministers of the gospel and members of the churches, authors of books and editors of periodicals—have been led to inquire whether this is not the real cause why the natives of Africa have been brought in such numbers to this land, and whether with this view, and with reference to an

end so desirable, it will not be found, on a closer study of the Bible, that it so far sanctions slavery as to justify the present arrangements in regard to it in the United States, and whether it is not the manifest will of God that slavery should exist, and be perpetuated until an object so desirable shall have been accomplished.

The result of this investigation is thus stated by Dr. Ross, in a passage already referred to:

"The relation of master and slave is sanctioned by the Bible; it is a relation belonging to the same category as those of husband and wife, parent and child, master and apprentice, master and hireling; the relation of slavery, as a system of labor, is only one form of the government ordained of God over fallen and degraded man."—p. 99. "The Southern slaveholder is now satisfied, as never before, that the relation of master and slave is sanctioned by the Bible."—p. 101.

Thus also he says, that the Bible commands the slave to know

"The facts in his case as they are *in the Bible*, and have ever been, and ever will be in Providence; that he is not the white man's equal—that he can never have his level—that he must not claim it, but that he can have, and ought to have, and must have, all of good, IN HIS CONDITION AS A SLAVE, until God may reveal a higher happiness for him in some other relation than he MUST EVER BEAR to the Anglo-American."—p. 157, *et saepe*.

So also he is reported in the *Richmond Whig* to have said in the Richmond Convention:

"I believe that slavery is ordained of God. It is a good to the master, to the slave, and to the country, so long as He chooses to continue it. It may have many evils, but, so long as it exists, it must be regarded as a benevolent institution, which has elevated

a portion of mankind from degradation, and given them all of Christ that can be given to them."

By a singular coincidence also, it has occurred that while the minds of statesmen and philanthropists in this country were turned to the inquiry about the relation of slavery to the Bible, a similar inquiry has been suggested in regard to polygamy, and with a similar result. It has long been a prevalent opinion in the church that the Bible is unfriendly to polygamy, and that the tendency of a circulation of the Scriptures and of the spread of the Gospel, would be to remove it where it exists, and to substitute views of the marriage relation wholly inconsistent with the existence of that institution. The Fathers of the Christian Church in general, though not all, as Bishop Colenso has shown, held that opinion; the opinion was adopted as an article of faith for ages in the church; most of the treatises on marriage written under Christian influence have maintained that opinion—the work of Milton being in fact almost the only exception for ages; the laws of Christian countries are, for the most part, based on this idea; and the opinion has been supposed to be an essential doctrine to be propagated among the heathen, and to be urged upon converts from idolatry. Nearly, if not quite all, the missionary operations of this age have been conducted on the idea that polygamy is contrary to the Bible, and that in establishing churches among the heathen it was necessary that converts from heathenism should separate themselves from all their wives but one.

This doctrine, however, has not worked well in the missionary enterprise. It has been attended with

evils which it has not been found practicable to remove, and has been, and is, a serious obstruction to the propagation of Christianity in Pagan nations. It must, from the nature of the case, be attended with great hardships when a man is compelled to part with so large a portion of his family; to sunder ties that are so tender; to send out a woman upon the world with all the odium of being a rejected wife, and with no means of support. It is, and must be, a serious obstruction in propagating the gospel when it comes in contact with "domestic institutions," sustained by the laws, and sanctioned by the habits of the people for centuries. It has been found, also, that the views of missionaries in regard to polygamy, not only tended in this way to prevent the spread of Christianity, but that they also tended to make men infidels—it being found impossible to convince the heathen that a book which sets itself so directly against established laws and customs, and which claims the right to modify domestic arrangements to such an extent, can be from God.

Some of these difficulties are thus stated by Bishop Colenso:

"But the conscience of a man must revolt *at first* from the present practice, however fearfully it may become blunted *at last*, by perpetual reiteration of the law of the Mission Station, and the (supposed) Will of the Almighty. The man, if he thinks at all, must be utterly bewildered between the sense of his duty to God, (or rather to the Teacher, who has become, as it were, a God to him, and is framing anew for him his standard of right and wrong,) and the dictates of his own heart and mind, which tell him so truly, that, whatever he may be willing to do to secure his soul's salvation, he has no right to sacrifice his wives, their feelings, their marriage-bonds, their rights, and the rights of their

children. For who shall marry them again? They have already grown old in his service. Their youth and comeliness are gone. They have their children it is true; and with these are they to be cast forth, like Hagar into the desert, to become suppliants for the charity of the first compassionate wayfaring Kafir? Or is the Christian husband to pension them off, with the help of Mission Funds, (as I have heard was the case under a certain Missionary, no longer in the colony,) and to keep them in his neighborhood, within the reach of his counsel and assistance, for the management and training of his children, compelled to live separate from other men, but as wives of his own no longer, not even in name? Or is the *husband* to take possession of all the children? and is the wife to go, like her of whom I have written in my Journal, to tell the story of her woe to the Missionary,—"You have not only taken my husband from me, but my child also!" And these things are done in the name of Christianity? And this is one of the very first notices, which the heathens are to receive, of the working of that Gospel, which was to be 'glad tidings of great joy to all people.'

"I verily believe, that, in consequence mainly of the enforcement of this rule, our blessed religion already stinks in the nostrils of this people. It is not the purity, the charity, the piety, which it enjoins—it is not this, which makes the native shrink, with dislike and distrust, from the very first approach of a Missionary. The heart within them will confess to the excellency of these things; their spirit will respond to the Law of God that it is good, even when the flesh refuses to obey it. But here the mind of the savage—the best instincts of his nature—his regard for the sanctity of marriage, for the peace and welfare of his family,—take part with his ignorance and evil passions in repelling the advances of the Missionary."

"Have the Missionaries ever duly considered this—the effect, I mean, which the reception of the Gospel, *on any large scale*, among this people, and the carrying out of their rule, would produce on the *order* of the colony, when every kraal and every hut, almost, would be the scene of some enforced separation, and of the hideous consequences that must follow, where so many married women, released from the law of their husbands and the

strict discipline of their native customs,—with their best feelings outraged, and their passions inflamed, themselves and their children branded, in their people's eyes, with a name of dishonor,—are turned loose upon their tribes?"—*Remarks on Polygamy.*

So deep-rooted has this attachment to the system of polygamy become among the heathen, that it is a matter of serious doubt whether it is *possible* to effect any immediate change, and whether the rules of the Missionaries on the subject ever have been complied with. Thus Bishop Colenso says:

"But the truth is, as I make bold to believe, that there is not an instance to be produced, in all the experience of the Missionaries of Natal—American, Wesleyan, or Lutheran—of a man being brought to profess Christianity, who, before his conversion, was a polygamist *on any large scale*, and who has accordingly submitted to the authority of his teacher, and put away all his wives but one. There may, possibly, be a case or two produced, of a man with *two* wives, who may have been induced, by the urgent representations of the Missionary, and severe denunciations of the Divine displeasure, to put away one of them: and I venture to say that, if the truth were told, there would be in every such case some piteous tale of 'wrong,' like that of the Kafir woman, whose words I have above quoted. But has any man with three, four, or more wives, consented to this practice? In other words, has any *chief* man of the district, in his maturer years, become a Christian?"—*Ibid.*

It has become, therefore, a serious inquiry, whether the true teachings of the Bible on the subject have not been misunderstood; and whether instead of insisting that converts from heathenism should at once separate themselves from so large a portion of their families, and abandon them to want—rudely and harshly sundering most tender ties, and preventing the general reception

of the Gospel—it would not be more in accordance with the principles of the Bible to tolerate for a time what seems to be an evil; to admit true converts to the Church without requiring them at once to put away their wives; to bring their wives and children under the influence of the Gospel, and to trust to time, and to a gradual increase in knowledge, for removing polygamy itself, believing that under the influence of the Gospel, the evil, so far as it is an evil, will work its own remedy in the same manner in which the gentle influences of the Gospel will gradually remove the evils of slavery.

To this conclusion, Bishop Colenso, after a careful consideration of the subject, and of the practical workings of the teachings of missionaries on heathen ground, has come—in language remarkably similar to that of Dr. Ross on the kindred subject of slavery. Thus he says:

"Having observed, in the Natal journals of late, some articles on the subject of polygamy, which require, I think, a reply from those *who have given more serious attention to the question than the writers of the said articles* appear generally to have done, I have thought it proper to set on paper the following observations.

"I certainly expressed a doubt, in my published Journal, whether the method, at present adopted by the Missionaries, of requiring a man, who had more than one wife, to put away all but one, before he could be received to Christian Baptism, was the *right* way of accomplishing this end. I have since given much closer consideration to the question, and I have now no hesitation in saying, that I believe the above-mentioned rule to be unwarranted by Scripture, *opposed to the practice of the Apostles*, condemned by common reason, and altogether unjustifiable.

"Polygamy was a *state* of life—a *permanent* condition—not a temporary, occasional condition, in which the man might be found to-day, but not to-morrow. Thus a man might be subject

to fits of passion, or of drunkenness; but they would be no bar to his becoming a Christian. Rather, if he were sincere in his desire to get the better of all this evil, he would be encouraged to seek the strength of God, by coming to Holy Baptism. Nor, should he afterwards be overtaken in a fault, and be overcome by his besotting sin, would he, therefore, be at once excommunicated or expelled from the Church.

"But if polygamy be pronounced positively *sinful* in itself, without regard being had to the state of moral culture and civilization, in which a man has hitherto been living, it would be a complete bar to his being received into the Church at all."

Bishop Colenso, after considering the argument from the Bible in favor of polygamy, then states what is the true way of preaching the Gospel to the heathen so as to avoid the evils which have thus far attended every effort to introduce it when it is held that polygamy is contrary to the Bible. His views on this point are remarkably in accordance with the views of Dr. Ross as to the method of preaching the Gospel in those portions of our country where slavery exists. Thus he says:

"Nor do I believe there will be anything done effectively to this end until a system is adopted more in accordance with the true spirit of Christianity, and the example of the Apostles themselves. If I am asked to say plainly what I desire, and, as far as I have any influence and power, intend by God's grace to do in this matter, I say then plainly, *not* to require the putting away of wives by natives, married previously to the reception of Christianity. As I have stated before, I *dare* not do so: I dare not even recommend it to any man. If the unbelieving wife *wishes* to depart from her husband, so be it. But if not, I am bound to tell him that it is his DUTY to *keep* her, and to *cherish her as his wife*, until 'death parts them.'

"Instead of opening Missionary Stations, as refuges for the disorderly and discontented, it is my intention to send Missionaries direct to the heathen kraals, first to acquire the language

and become familiar with the habits of the people, and then to settle permanently, and live and labor in the midst of them. Of course, we shall require a central Station, where different operations may be carried on such as are detailed in my Journal; where a native village may by degrees be formed of a higher class, from among the most promising and willing converts in different parts of the country; and where superior schools may be conducted, with a view of training native teachers. But I am persuaded that the main work of converting the natives is to be attempted, and, by God's help and blessing, accomplished, only by establishing schools and schoolmasters in direct connection with the native villages—some five or six, or perhaps ten of which may be placed under the supervision of each Missionary Clergyman. And the first step I would take towards introducing such schools, and securing the favor of the chiefs towards them, *would be to assure them most positively, that we do not intend to interfere with their married life, as already constituted*—that we do not think it necessary, nor according to God's Will and the demands of our holy religion, to require them to signalize their acceptance of Christianity by a direct act of perfidy and wrong."

Thus also Dr. Ross, on the right treatment of slavery, says:

"Slavery is to continue for the good of the slave—until another and better destiny may be unfolded." "The present slaveholder stands *exactly* in the NICK *of time and of place*, in the course of Providence, where *wrong*, in the transmission of African slavery, *ends*, and *right begins*." "Slavery is wise, good, yea best, in certain circumstances, until, in the elevating spirit and power of the Gospel, the slave is made fit for the liberty and equality of the master, if he can ever be so lifted up."—pp. 5, 155, 157, 183.

The points which are established in the two works now under consideration, in respect to Polygamy and Slavery, are the following:

(1.) *Both are very ancient institutions.* They are found, and found alike, in the very infancy of society,

and appear to have sprung up simultaneously with the other social and domestic arrangements which were found to be necessary for the good of mankind. Even if it could not be demonstrated that they, like the institution of marriage, *had* an express divine sanction in the beginning, it would seem that like the early discoveries in the arts necessary for life, or contributing to the comforts of society—the arts of tillage and pasturage, (Gen. iv. 2, 3;) the art of tent-making, (Gen. iv. 20;) the improvement of the breeding of cattle, and the skill evinced in subjecting them to domestic use, (Gen. iv. 20;) the discovery of the use of metals, (Gen. iv. 22;) and the invention of instruments of music, (Gen. iv. 21,) they had a very early origin; and sprang, like those inventions and arts, from the necessities of society. Indeed, it is difficult to determine which of these had the priority in the perceived necessities of mankind—whether slavery, polygamy, the invention of instruments of music, the use of metals, or the art of tent-making. It would seem not improbable that polygamy and slavery in fact *preceded*, in the order of time, most of those discoveries and inventions, as they were more immediately demanded for the comfort of mankind than the use of musical instruments, and would more early occupy the attention of men than the questions about property in cattle.

Thus Dr. Ross, speaking of the fact that slavery is in accordance "with the unfoldings of the divine will," traces it up to the earliest periods of the world. The facts in regard to its early existence, he says, "stare us in the face:" "In the family of Abraham—in Hagar, running away under her mistress's hard dealing unto

her, and yet sent back, as a fugitive slave,* by the angel —in the law which authorized the Hebrews to hold their brethren as slaves," etc.

In like manner, it is clear from Dr. Ross, that polygamy had an origin at least as early in the history of mankind, and in the necessities of society. Thus he says, "God made no law against polygamy *in the beginning*.† Therefore it was no sin," that is, in the *beginning*, "for a man to have more wives than one. God *sanctioned* it, and made laws in regard to it. Abraham had more wives than one; Jacob had, David had, Solomon had." p. 44. He might have added, that at a much earlier period—at the very period designated above as that of the most remarkable discoveries and inventions—when the attention of mankind was first turned to breeding cattle—to the construction of tents—to the use of metals—and to music, (Gen. iv.) a patriarch—Lamech "*took unto him two wives*," (Gen. iv. 19,)—thus early illustrating a principle which seems to have run extensively through society, that the most valuable inventions, and the most useful customs in life, have sprung up in *groups*, the one suggesting, or drawing on the other by a law of association that has contributed more than anything else to the real progress of the race. Thus the art of printing, in a later age, drew in its train innumerable blessings connected with

* The circumstance here alluded to shows also, that the provisions of the Fugitive Slave Law, towards which so much opposition has been manifested by Northern fanatics, is in exact accordance with the teachings of the Bible:—the propriety of the law being established not only by the *fact* that Hagar was sent back "as a fugitive slave," but particularly that this was done "*by the angel*." This fact may be further referred to, as justifying the Apostle Paul in sending back Onesimus, as it justifies also, all the provisions of the "Fugitive Slave Law."

† The *italics* here are by the author of these remarks.

civil, social, and domestic life; and so in the period of the world referred to in Genesis iv., at the time of the discovery of the use of "cattle," and of the value of brass and iron; when men began to "dwell in tents," and when they invented instruments of music, these facts drew along with them the blessings of polygamy and slavery.

The views of Bishop Colenso in regard to the antiquity of the institution of polygamy, is in entire accordance with these facts and with the views of Dr. Ross. Thus he says: "There is no question that the practice of polygamy was not only tolerated among the Jews, but even sanctioned by the examples of eminent and pious men among them, and, in one instance, by the words of a Prophet, uttering a direct message from the Almighty. For, not to mention other cases, that will readily occur to the reader, we have those of Abraham, the 'father of the faithful,' and David, the 'man after God's own heart,' who were both polygamists."*

(2.) It is established, in like manner, in regard to polygamy and slavery, that they are both "*patriarchal*" institutions.

That *slavery* is a "patriarchal" institution, having the sanction of the best men of ancient times, has been amply demonstrated by Dr. Ross. Thus, in referring to the "facts" on the subject as illustrated by "the Bible and Providence," he says, addressing Mr. Barnes:

"In the Old Testament, they stare you in the face:—in the family of Abraham,—in his slaves, bought with his money and born in his house,—in Hagar, running away under her mistress's

* The very cases referred to by Dr. Ross.

hard dealing with her, and yet sent back, as a fugitive slave, by the angel,—in the law which authorized the Hebrews to hold their brethren as slaves for a time,—in which parents might sell their children into bondage,—in which the heathen were given to the Hebrews as their slaves forever,—in which slaves were considered so much the money of their master, that the master who killed one by an unguarded blow was, under certain circumstances, sufficiently punished in his slave's death, because he thereby lost his money,—in which the difference between *man-stealing* and *slave-holding* is, by law, set forth,—in which the runaway from heathen masters may not be restored, because God gave him the benefits of an adopted Hebrew."—pp. 100, 101. See also pp. 58—64.

The same thing, also, has been fully demonstrated both by Dr. Ross and Bishop Colenso in regard to polygamy. Thus Dr. Ross, in a passage already referred to, in reply to a question put to him in debate, whether he "regarded the Bible as sustaining the polygamy of the Old Testament," says:

"Yes, sir; yes, sir, yes, sir; I fearlessly tell what the Bible says. In its strength, I am not afraid of earth or hell. I fear only God. *God made no law against polygamy in the beginning.* Therefore it was no sin for a man to have more wives than one. God *sanctioned* it, and made laws in regard to it. Abraham had more wives than one; Jacob had, David had, Solomon had. God told David, by the mouth of Nathan, when he upbraided him with ingratitude for the blessings he had given him, and said, 'And I gave thee thy master's house, and *thy master's wives* into thy bosom.'" (2 Sam. xii. 8.)—pp. 44, 45.

The same point has been demonstrated, and by a reference to the same facts, in the following language by Bishop Colenso: "Not to mention other cases, that will readily occur to the reader, we have those of Abraham, the 'father of the faithful,' and David, the 'man

after God's own heart,' who were both polygamists; so that, certainly, it is possible that the practice should coexist with a very high degree of excellence and holiness of life." Bishop Colenso then refers, in proof of the fact that it was "freely permitted among the Jewish people," to Deut. xxi. 15, 16, and in connection with this, quotes the very passage, referred to by Dr. Ross, from 2 Sam. xii. 8, "I gave *thy master's wives* into thy bosom."

Both institutions, therefore, are *patriarchal*. In this respect they are on the same basis. Both have been "sanctioned" by good men; by the examples of the most eminent saints that the world has known; by men who are held up as models to all coming times; by men of "whom the world was not worthy," Heb. xi. 38, and it must be presumed that these facts were recorded that, in this, as in other respects, they might illustrate what would be the best type of character and of social life in coming ages. Whatever may be said, therefore, to the contrary, the slaveholder and the polygamist may shelter themselves under the authority and sanction of these eminent men, and can feel no rebukes of conscience in modes of life that have so illustrious and so pure examples.

(3.) Both institutions were "legislated" for in the Old Testament; that is, they entered into a part of the arrangements of society in reference to which laws were enacted. These laws were made not for removing either as an evil, but for regulating them in the same way as laws were made to regulate the relations of husband and wife, parent and child, guardian and ward.

Thus, of slavery, Dr. Ross has shown, that "the relation of master and slave is sanctioned by the Bible; that

it is a relation belonging to the same category as those of husband and wife, parent and child, master and apprentice, master and hireling," p. 99; that "the sun will grow dim with age before that Scripture [Lev. xxv. 44, 46,] can be tortured to mean anything else than just what it says: *that God commanded the Israelites to be slaveholders in the strict and true sense over the heathen*," p. 148; that "Abraham lived in the midst of a system of slaveholding *exactly the same in nature* with that in the South—*a system ordained of God as really as the other forms of government around him*"—making himself the master of slaves—men, women, and children, "BY THE DIVINE BLESSING," and "controlling them as property, just as really as the Southern master in the present day," p. 153.

What has thus been shown to be true in regard to slavery, has also been demonstrated respecting polygamy. That was equally the subject of divine legislation and care. Thus Dr. Ross: "The Bible *sustains* the polygamy of the Old Testament," p. 44. "It was no sin for a man to have more wives than one." *Ibid.* "God sanctioned it, and MADE LAWS in regard to it;" that is, he *legislated* for it. *Ibid.*

So Bishop Colenso: "We have the passage in Deuteronomy," [xxi. 15, 16,] "which distinctly recognizes polygamy, as freely permitted among the Jewish people." So he says, also, in reference to the passage above quoted from 2 Sam. xii. 8—"I gave thee thy *master's wives* unto thy bosom"—that this was an "*express blessing from the Almighty.*"

But it was scarcely necessary for either Dr. Ross or Bishop Colenso to have labored this point at all. To

the plainest apprehension it is clear that very much of the legislation in the books of Moses pertains to the relations of slavery and polygamy; that numerous laws were ordained designed to regulate both these relations; that they were both regarded as states of society which would exist in the Hebrew Commonwealth as certainly as the relation of husband and wife, parent and child, guardian and ward, master and apprentice, and, what is material to the present point, that *there is as much legislation for one case as for the other.* Both seem to be placed on the same basis in the Old Testament, and whatever considerations a Jew might have urged as justifying slavery, either from the antiquity of the custom, the example of holy men, or the laws of Moses, the same considerations could have been urged by him in favor of polygamy. Although, therefore, there is no direct evidence that either David or Solomon was a slaveholder, and, therefore, slaveholding has not the sanction of their example as polygamy has, yet it is clear that they could have justified the fact that they *had numerous wives* on the same ground on which any slaveholder of their time could have justified slavery, and by the same considerations on which Dr. Ross now justifies slavery in the Southern States.

(4.) A more material consideration is, that *both are placed on the same level in the New Testament.* It might be questionable whether the legislation of Moses in either case was designed to be permanent, and was not intended to be superseded by the brighter revelation of the Gospel, and to some minds it might not be clear that the *example* of the patriarchs was designed to furnish a guide in future times in either of those respects,

any more than that the drunkenness of Noah, the incest of Lot, the duplicity of Abraham and Jacob, or the acts of murder and adultery into which David was betrayed, were designed to be *examples* to holy men of future generations—for although they *are* held up as examples, (Hebrews xi. *et saepe*,) it is not so clear that *in these respects* they are to be our examples, and it might have been doubted, therefore, whether it was designed that, as polygamists and slaveholders, they should be regarded as examples for future ages. It was very important, therefore, to show that both polygamy and slavery are sanctioned by the New Testament, or that neither of them is declared to be a "*sin.*" On this point the arguments of Dr. Ross and Bishop Colenso coincide, as showing that however the Gospel may tend to remove the *incidental evils* of the two systems, they are not to be regarded as *sinful*, even if it should be admitted that the general "spirit" of the New Testament is against the two systems, and that the *ultimate* effect of the Gospel might tend greatly to modify them, or possibly in some future age, and in a greatly improved condition of society, wholly to remove them. But in regard to the main point, the *sinfulness* of the two systems, it is shown by Dr. Ross and Bishop Colenso that they are on a level in the New Testament.

The *facts* on this point, as apparent from the nature of the case, and the statements of Dr. Ross and Bishop Colenso, are the following:

(*a.*) The Saviour found both systems existing in his time. This is distinctly asserted by Bishop Colenso—and indeed is a point which could not be called in question. Thus he says, "We come now to the times of

the New Testament. And here it is unnecessary to remark (what is generally unnoticed by those who hastily argue on this subject) that the Jews, in our Lord's time, and after it, *were decided polygamists.*" The same thing is assumed and asserted by Dr. Ross in regard to slavery; and though it must be admitted that no decided instance has ever been pointed out in which the Saviour came in contact with slavery, and no clear evidence has been furnished of its existence in Palestine in the time of the Saviour, yet it is so constantly assumed and asserted by those best read in the history of those times, that this was so, that it is unreasonable to call it in question, and the point may be regarded as demonstrated.

(*b.*) Both were *tolerated* by the Saviour and his Apostles. This has been fully shown by Dr. Ross in regard to slavery. Thus he says, (p. 101,) in speaking of the fact that slavery is "vindicated in the Bible and Providence:" "In the New Testament—where the slavery of Greece and Rome was recognized—in the obligations laid *on the* master and slave—in the close connection of this obligation with the duties of husband and wife, parent and child—in the obligations to return the fugitive slave to his master—and *in the condemnation of every abolition principle* 'AS DESTITUTE OF THE TRUTH.'" See also pp. 176, 185, *et passim.*

The same thing has been shown by Bishop Colenso in regard to polygamy. Thus he says, speaking of the teaching of the Saviour, "Though, among those addressed by our Lord, there must have been men with more than one wife, *He never condemns this as sinful and displeasing in God's sight:*" a fact remarkably in accordance with the teaching of the Saviour and the apos-

tles in regard to slavery—and, a fact about which there can be no dispute with those who are familiar with the New Testament. It is very evident, nay it is certain—as will be seen by a reference to the proofs in the Essay of Bishop Colenso, and from the well-known facts in Jewish history, that polygamy *did* exist in the time of the Saviour, and it seems hardly credible that in the whole course of his ministry, mingling as he did freely with all classes of men, he should never have come in contact with it; and yet it is strictly true, that however many such cases *may* have occurred, he never, in reference to any specific case, required a separation of husbands and wives, and according to Dr. Ross,* never condemns it as "sinful" or wrong. In this respect, therefore, the two systems are on a level.

(*c.*) Neither polygamy nor slavery is condemned in the New Testament as "*sin.*"

Then Dr. Ross says, of slavery, "Let the Northern philanthropist learn *from the Bible*, that the relation of master and slave is not sin *per se*. Let him learn that God says *nowhere it is sin*. Let him learn that sin is the transgression of the law; and that *the Golden Rule* may exist in the relations of slavery." p. 6. So also, Dr. Ross says:

* "*Christ and his apostles do not declare polygamy to be a sin.*" Dr. Ross, p. 45. It is true, that Dr. Ross (*Ibid.*) says that "*Polygamy now is sin*:"—but it is difficult to see how this can be when, on the same page he says, that it is "*not* because it is in itself *sin*;" "that Christ and his apostles did not *declare* polygamy to be sin," and that the only design in prohibiting it at all is, in his language, "to restrain the natural and social evil, and *to bring out a higher humanity*." *Ibid.* A condition *may* possibly yet arise where it would be possible in connection with polygamy "*to bring out a higher humanity*," and if so, then polygamy would cease to be a sin altogether. That is, it is not, in fact, a sin at all.

"The precepts in Colossians iv. 18, 23, 1 Tim. vi. 1–6, and other places, show, unanswerably, that God as really sanctioned the relation of master and slave as those of husband and wife, and parent and child; and that all the obligations of the moral law, and Christ's law of love, might and must be as truly fulfilled in the one relation as the other. The fact that he has made the one set of relations permanent, and the other more or less dependent on conditions of mankind, or to pass away in the advancement of human progress, does not touch the question. He sanctioned it under the Old Testament and the New, and ordains it now while he sees it best to continue it, and he now, as heretofore, proclaims the duty of the master and the slave." pp. 64, 65.

In fact, a considerable part of Dr. Ross' book is occupied in making this point clear, that the Bible *nowhere* speaks of slavery as a *sin*. See particularly pp. 176–185.

The same thing is also shown to be the teaching of the New Testament, as well as the Old, in regard to polygamy. Thus, in a passage already quoted in a note, Dr. Ross says: "CHRIST AND HIS APOSTLES DO NOT DECLARE POLYGAMY TO BE A SIN." The polygamist, therefore, should not regard himself as committing *sin*. There may be reasons why polygamy may be undesirable, and on account of those reasons Christianity may ultimately remove it from the world; but men should never regard it as a thing to be prohibited or removed because it is a "*sin*;" and he who condemns it as a "sin," is clearly opposed to the teaching of "Christ and his apostles."

It goes far to confirm this argument of Dr. Ross, that Bishop Colenso has arrived at the same conclusion by an independent line of thought. Thus of polygamy, and of the practice of the missionaries in requiring converts from heathenism to separate themselves from all their wives but one, he says: "I have no hesitation in

saying, that I believe the above mentioned rule" [the rule requiring this] "to be unwarranted by Scripture, *opposed to the practice of the apostles*, condemned by common sense, and altogether unjustifiable."

(*d.*) It has, in like manner, been demonstrated by Dr. Ross and Bishop Colenso, that slavery and polygamy should be treated in the same way in the church, and in civil communities. Neither is to be regarded as in itself an evil, though both may be *connected with* such evils or abuses as may need to be corrected. But there should be no attempt to correct those evils suddenly, and especially when they are sanctioned by law. In the two systems there are too many interests involved in the relations of masters and slaves, and of husbands and wives and children, and too many rights in the community that may be jeoparded by any sudden and violent movement, to justify an effort suddenly to bring either of these relations to an end. It should be left to the slow but certain influence of the gospel, in gradually removing the evils incident to either system; and in reference to both, the interests of religion and humanity require that nothing shall be done, until it will be found to be for the "good" of those who sustain those relations. The gospel would tend silently and gradually to remove whatever evils these may be, as growing out of *abuse* in the two relations, as it will the incidental wrongs and cruelties which may at any time grow out of the relation of husband and wife, parent and child,* and *if the time should ever occur*, when it would be for the "good" of all concerned, that the relations should

* "I say deliberately, that he who will make the horrid examination will discover in New York city, in any number of years past, more cruelty from husband to wife, parent to child, *than in all the South from master to slave in the same time.*"—Dr. Ross, p. 53.

cease entirely, the gospel will, by a fair application, ultimately secure the result.

Thus Dr. Ross says of slavery, "that it will remain so long as God sees it best, as a controlling power over the ignorant, the more degraded and helpless; and that, when he sees it for the good of the country, he will cause it to pass away, *if the slave* CAN BE *elevated to liberty and equality*, political and social, with his master, *in* that country; or *out* of that country, if such elevation cannot be given therein, but may be realized in some other land: all which result must be left to the unfoldings of the divine will." pp. 99, 100. So again, (p. 6,) "Let the Northern philanthropist learn that equality is only the highest form of social life; that subjection to authority, even slavery, may, in given conditions, be for a time better than freedom to the slaves of any complexion. Let him learn that slavery, like all evils, has its *corresponding* and GREATER good; that the Southern slave, though degraded compared with his master, is elevated and ennobled compared with his brethren in Africa."

So also he says, (pp. 156, 157:)

"What, then, does God command him [the master] to do? Does God require him to send the negro back to his heathen home from whence he was stolen? That home no longer exists. But, if it did remain, does God command the master to send his Christianized slave into the horrors of his former African heathenism? No. God has placed the master under law entirely different from his command to the slave-trader. God said to the trader, *Let the negro alone.* But he says to the present master, *Do unto the negro all the good you can; make him a civilized man; make him a Christian man; lift him up and give him all he has a right to claim in the good of the whole community.* This

the master can do; this he must do, and then leave the result with the Almighty.

"We reach the same conclusion by asking, What does God say to the negro-slave?

"Does he tell him to ask to be sent back to heathen Africa? No. Does he give him authority to claim a created equality and unalienable right to be on a level with the white man in civil and social relations? No. To ask the first would be to ask a great evil; to claim the second is to demand a natural and moral impossibility. No. God tells him to seek none of these things. But he commands him to know the facts in his case as they are in the Bible, and have ever been, and ever will be in Providence: that he is not the white man's equal—that he can never have his level—that he must not claim it; but that he can have, and ought to have, and must have, all of good, in his condition as a slave, until God may reveal a higher happiness for him in some other relation than that *he must ever* have to the Anglo-American. The present slaveholder, then, by declining to emancipate his bondman, does not place himself in the *guilt* of the man-stealer or of those who had complicity with him; but he stands *exactly* in that NICK *of time and place*, in the course of Providence, where *wrong*, in the transmission of African slavery *ends*, and *right begins*."

So, also, the Apostle Paul taught the same thing. The *spirit* of what he taught is conveyed in the following paraphrase by Dr. Ross, pp. 182, 183, 184:

"I found slavery in Asia, in Greece, in Rome. I saw it to be one mode of the government ordained of God. I regarded it, in most conditions of fallen mankind, necessarily and irresistibly part of such government, and therefore as natural, as wise, as good, in such conditions, as the other ways men are ruled in the state or family.

"I took up slavery, then, as such ordained government—wise, good, yea best, in certain circumstances, until, in the elevating spirit and power of my gospel, the slave is made fit for the liberty and equality of his master, if he can be so lifted up. Hence I make the RULE of magistrate, subject, master and servant, parent

and child, husband and wife, THE SAME RULE; *i. e.* I make it THE SAME RIGHT in the *superior* to control the *obedience* and the *service* of the *inferior*, bound to obey, whatever the difference in the relations and service to be rendered. Yea, I give *exactly the same command* to all in these relations; and thus, in all my words, I make it plainly to be understood that I regard slavery to be as righteous a mode of government as that of magistrate and subject, parent and child, husband and wife, during the circumstances and times in which God is pleased to have it continue. I saw all the injustice, the oppression, the cruelty, masters might be guilty of, and were and are now guilty of; but I saw no more injustice, oppression, and cruelty, in the relation of master and slave, than I saw in all other forms of rule—even in that of husband and wife, parent and child. In my gospel I condemn wrong in all these states of life, while I fully sanction and sustain the relations themselves. I tell the magistrate, husband, father, master, how to rule; I tell the subject, wife, child, servant, how to submit. Hence, I command the slave not to flee from bondage, just as I require the subject, the wife, the child, not to resist or flee from obedience. I warn the slave, if he leaves his master he has sinned, and must return; and I make it the duty of all men to see to it, that *he shall go back*. Hence, I myself did what I command others to do: I sent Onesimus back to his master.

"Thus I sanction slavery everywhere in the New Testament."

The evils of polygamy are to be removed in the same way as those of slavery, and it is remarkable that Bishop Colenso has specified the proper way of treating the subject in language remarkably similar to that which Dr. Ross has employed on the subject of slavery. "I am persuaded," says he, "that the main work of converting the natives is to be attempted, and, by God's help and blessing, accomplished only by establishing schools and schoolmasters in direct connection with the native villages—some five or six, or, perhaps, ten of

which may be placed under the supervision of each missionary or clergyman. *And the first step I would take, towards introducing such schools, and securing the favor of the chiefs towards them, would be to assure them most positively, that we do not intend to interfere with married life as already constituted.*" "If the unbelieving wife *wishes* to depart from her husband, so be it. But if not, I am bound to tell him it is his DUTY to *keep* her, and *cherish her as his wife*, until 'death parts them.'"

So Dr. Ross on slavery: "*Slavery is of God*, and to continue for the good of the slave, the good of the master, the good of the whole American family, until another and a better destiny be unfolded." p. 5.

The *sum* of the teachings of the Bible on these subjects, as shown by Dr. Ross and Bishop Colenso, is, that slavery and polygamy are patriarchal and Scriptural institutions; that they are sanctioned by the example of the best men of ancient times—among others, by the "father of the faithful," and the "man after God's own heart;" that they have been equally supported by legislation in the Bible; that neither of them is condemned in the Bible, as a "sin," either in the Old Testament or in the New; that though there are evils incident to both systems, yet there are also evils in every relation of life—in the relations of husband and wife, parent and child, guardian and ward, master and apprentice; that the way to remedy these evils is not madly to attack the *system* as sinful, but to apply the Gospel in preparing the minds of men to remove them, and to wait the certain operation of time; that it may be hoped the Gospel, in its mild and happy influences, will, in due time, prepare men to put away the evils incident to

the two systems, as it will the evils incident to the relations of husband and wife, and the abuses of government; that a period *may* arrive when it would be for the good of all concerned that *the relations themselves* should cease, but that the coming of that period is dependent wholly on the Providence of God; and that any undue agitation of the subject—either of slavery in the Southern States, or of polygamy in the kraals of Africa—would only tend to rivet the chains of slavery more firmly in the one case, and make the condition of the African wife more undesirable in the other.

It cannot but be hoped that the almost simultaneous publication of two independent treatises on these subjects, so materially correcting the prevailing interpretations of the Bible, will have some very important effects on the general interests of religion in the world. To some of these effects it may be proper to advert in the conclusion of these remarks.

First. These views must have an important bearing on the propagation of religion, especially in removing obstructions which have been hitherto found to be almost insuperable in the spread of Christianity.

The views entertained by the Christian church in regard to polygamy, have been at all times a great hindrance in the efforts to spread the gospel among the heathen. In fact the doctrine that in order to the reception of the gospel, it was necessary for men to sunder the ties which bound them to their wives, and almost entirely to break up their domestic arrangements before they could become Christians, has constituted an obstacle in spreading Christianity among the heathen, scarcely less seri-

ous than it would be in a community where monogamy is the prevailing custom, to require men, in order to embrace a new form of religion, to become anchorites, and to withdraw wholly from the amenities and comforts of domestic life. Among the heathen where polygamy prevails, as it does now, and always has done extensively, all that there is in the antiquity of the custom, in the fact that it is protected by the laws, in the idea that it contributes, as wealth does with us, to respectability of position, and indicates elevation of rank, as well as all the tenderness of affection existing at any time in the relation itself, and all that seems cruel and harsh in reality, in sundering those ties, and sending forth unprotected females upon the world, under the disgrace of having been *discarded* by their husbands, as having before lived in a relation offensive to God, rises up as an obstruction to the spread of the gospel, and these things have undoubtedly constituted some of the most material difficulties in the attempts which have been made to convert the heathen to Christianity. The difficulty is shown in the clearest manner by Bishop Colenso, who has had an ample opportunity of observing the effect of the attempt to inculcate on the minds of the heathen the doctrine respecting marriage which prevail among Christian nations, and which have hitherto been regarded as the teaching of the Scriptures on the subject. "I verily believe," says he, "that, in consequence mainly of the enforcement of this rule," [requiring men who are converted to put away their wives,] "*our blessed religion already* STINKS *in the nostrils of the people.* It is not the purity, the charity, the piety which it enjoins—it is not this, which makes the natives shrink,

with dislike and distrust, from the very approach of the missionary. The heart within them will confess to the excelleney of these things; their spirit will respond to the Law of God, that it is good, even when the flesh refuses to obey it. But here the mind of the savage—the best instincts of his nature—his regard for the sanctity of marriage,—for the peace and welfare of his family—take part with his ignorance and evil passions in repelling the advanees of the missionary."

On every account it is desirable that every obstruction to the spread of the Gospel among the heathen should be removed; that "the word of the Lord may have free eourse" among them; and the difficulties whieh have hitherto been experienced on this point would be effeetually removed by the views entertained by the Lord Bishop of Natal.

In like manner, very serious obstruetions to the progress of the Gospel would be removed by the prevalenee of the views entertained by the "Pastor of the Presbyterian Chureh, Huntsville, Alabama." No one can be ignorant of the fact that the views which have been entertained by the majority of Christians on the subjeet of slavery, have constituted a very serious obstruction to the propagation of the Gospel. There was so mueh in slavery, in ancient times, that as we have seen, was found to be eonducive to the formation of the best state of society; there is so much that tends direetly to elevate the master, and ultimately to elevate the slave; there is so mueh that is adapted to diffuse a lofty and ehivalrous spirit where it prevails; there is so much eomfort imparted by the system in domestie arrangements; there is so much in the faet that it has prevailed in the best

portions and periods of the world—under the patriarchs —in the Hebrew commonwealth—in Athens, giving to the Athenians the superiority which they had over other people—in Rome, contributing so greatly to its strength, its wealth, and its grandeur—that the views commonly entertained in regard to the teachings of the Bible on the subject have always presented a serious obstacle to the reception of the Gospel. Besides this, slavery is established by law; it is upheld by the authority of the state; it is incorporated into the very structure of social life, and it is desirable, if it can be done without sacrificing principle, that the Gospel should *not* come in collision with the laws or the settled domestic institutions of any people. And still farther, the institution of slavery is one that appertains solely to the people where it prevails, and is to be regulated by them, as shall be found most conducive to their comfort and prosperity, and the Gospel should not be made suddenly and ruthlessly to infringe on any such domestic arrangements of a people. If crime prevails; if there are certain social habits which are manifestly at variance with the law of God, then the friend of Christianity has no option; but in a case like that of slavery, it is undoubtedly a great hindrance to the spread of the Gospel that so large a portion of Christians have regarded *that* as a crime, and have been disposed to class it with acknowledged sins, rather than with the relations of husband and wife, parent and child, guardian and ward. Beyond a doubt, not a few Southern masters have been deterred from embracing Christianity from the prevailing impression—an impression caused in a considerable degree in former times by the preaching of the Gospel

as it was then understood as being adverse in its spirit to slavery—that if they did embrace Christianity, their views on this subject must be materially modified, and from the apprehension that their consciences might be troubled with the feeling that in continuing this relation they would be violating the plain principles of their religion.

It is clear, therefore, that the views of Dr. Ross would remove one of the most serious obstructions which have hitherto been encountered in our land to the propagation of the Gospel. Thousands of Southern Christian masters, relieved of apprehensions which they cherished on this subject, from the fear that they were in reality in their practice in conflict with the Bible, will love their religion more, and be better assured that they are walking in accordance with the "principles of the Bible; and thousands of Southern masters, who, on account of the views usually entertained on the subject, have stood aloof from the Church, it is to be hoped will now find the difficulties in the system of Christianity silently melt away, and cheerfully embrace a system of religion no longer regarded as hostile to the best interests of society—to the good of the master and the slave. Revivals of religion have, in fact, recently abounded much in the Southern States; and in proportion as these views extend, it may be hoped that there will be a more general attention to religion alike among masters and slaves. Nothing can be better fitted to secure this than a prevailing idea that religion smiles alike on the master and the slave in this relation—tending indeed to remove incidental evils which have sprung up, as they may in all the relations of life, but confirming the doctrine that

"slavery is of God, and is to continue for the good of the slave, the good of the master, the good of the whole American family, until another and a better destiny shall be unfolded." (Dr. Ross, p. 5.) In proportion, therefore, as these views shall prevail among those engaged in propagating the Gospel in Christian and heathen lands, it may be hoped that much of the prejudice now existing against the Gospel will die away; that many of the obstructions which now impede its progress will be removed; that the minds of polygamists among the heathen, and of slaveholders in our own country, will be inclined to embrace a system that looks mildly on existing relations of society, and that they will welcome a system which, while it would remove the incidental evils of any existing relations in life, will look benignantly on institutions that have been found to conduce to domestic happiness, and that tend ultimately to the elevation of any part of the human race.

Second. It may be hoped that important results will follow from the prevalence of these views in regard to infidelity.

It cannot be denied that the views which have been entertained heretofore, on the subjects now referred to, have had a material influence in keeping up infidelity in the world; in leading men to the conclusion that a book which inculcates those views could not be from God. It was natural that men who held slaves, and who regarded the system as one that was in accordance with the best interests of society, should turn from a book that was supposed to teach that that relation is sinful, and from a religion which required masters to emancipate those whom they held to service. In proportion,

also, as the views now beginning to prevail in regard to slavery in the places where it exists—that it is an institution connected with the best interests of society, and tending to the elevation of the African race, shall be extended, the tendency must be more and more to reject a book claiming to be a revelation, which is commonly understood to teach that the relation is itself sinful. It would be impossible, should such views prevail, to secure a general reception of such a book; and in order to secure the general reception of the Bible as a revelation, it was absolutely necessary to show that the Bible does *not* thus condemn slavery. The tendency to a rejection of the Bible, could be checked only by a revolution in public sentiment in regard to its actual teaching on the subject of slavery. This change in public sentiment, and this influence of the new views in regard to the doctrines of the Bible on the subject, are thus happily stated by Dr. Ross:

"Twenty-five years ago the religious mind of the South was leavened by wrong Northern training, on the great point of the right and wrong of slavery. Meanwhile, powerful intellects in the South, following the mere light of a healthy good sense, guided by the common grace of God, reached the very truth of this great matter,—namely, that the relation of the master and slave is not sin; and that, notwithstanding its admitted evils, it is a connection between the highest and the lowest races of man, revealing influences which may be, and will be, most benevolent for the ultimate good of the master and the slave,—conservative on the Union, by preserving the South from all forms of Northern fanaticism, and thereby being a great balance-wheel in the working of the tremendous machinery of our experiment of self-government. This seen result of slavery was found to be in absolute harmony with the word of God. These men, then, of highest grade of thought, who had turned in scorn from Northern no-

tions, now see, in the Bible, that these notions are false and silly. *They now read the Bible, never examined before, with growing respect.* God is honored, and his glory will be more and more in their salvation."—pp. 36, 37.

The happy effects of this change of views is also seen in the religious literature which is to be circulated mainly at the South. This effect is also thus stated by Dr. Ross:

"Uncle Tom's Cabin could not have been written twenty-five years ago. Dr. Nehemiah Adams's '*South-Side View*,' could not have been written twenty-five years ago. Nor Dr. Nathan Lord's '*Letter of Inquiry*.' Nor Miss Murray's book. Nor '*Cotton is King*.' Nor Bledsoe's '*Liberty and Slavery*.' These books, written in the midst of this agitation, are all of high, some the highest, reach of talent and noblest piety; all give, with increasing confidence, the present Southern Bible reading on Slavery. God is honored in his word. The re-action, when the first abolition-movement commenced, has been succeeded by the sober second thought of the South. The sun, stayed, is again travelling in the greatness of his strength, and will shine brighter and brighter to the perfect day."—p. 38.

From the similarity of the two subjects, as they have been illustrated in these Remarks, it is manifest that a corresponding effect must follow from the prevalence of just views of polygamy. It will ever be found to be difficult, if not impossible, to persuade the heathen that a book which regards polygamy as a *sin*, can be from God. The difficulty in this respect would be quite as great as that which arises from the institution of slavery; and it is as little to be expected that the heathen mind will be convinced that such a book is a revelation from heaven, as it is to expect that the minds of Southern

masters could be generally convinced that a book condemning slavery as sin can have a divine origin. It is, therefore, in reference to the general reception of the Bible as a book of divine revelation, most timely, that Dr. Ross and Bishop Colenso, on the opposite sides of the globe, should have been moved simultaneously to maintain views which will tend so directly to check the tendency to infidelity in the two hemispheres, and to prepare the minds of men for the reception of the Bible as containing a revelation from heaven.

Third. These views in regard to polygamy and slavery must contribute much to the permanent benefit of the African race. It is remarkable that the arguments of Dr. Ross and of Bishop Colenso, both have direct reference to that race, and are designed to promote its welfare:—the arguments of Bishop Colenso pertaining to the race in Africa, and those of Dr. Ross to the race in this country. It has been a much injured race. No portion of the human family has been subjected to so many wrongs. Africa, from the earliest time, has been the land of oppression, and the dwellers in other continents seem all to have combined against it. Cruelty and crime have prevailed in that land, and when its inhabitants have been removed to other lands, it seems only to have been that they might endure deeper wrong. It is remarkable, also, that all the schemes of benevolence hitherto suggested for Africa have failed. The plans of the American Colonization Society were undoubtedly originated in a sincere desire to promote the welfare of the African race; but Professor Adger, of the Presbyterian Theological Seminary of Columbia, South Carolina, has demonstrated that the plans of that

Society are utter failures,* and that nothing can now be hoped from it either in promoting the welfare of Africa, or in relieving the evils of slavery in this country. The emancipation of the slaves in the British West Indies in 1833, was hailed with joy by the world as a new era in the progress of humanity, but it has been demonstrated that *that* was a scheme of bad policy and mistaken philanthropy, and that the effect has been to *ruin* the islands where the acts of emancipation occurred. Then Dr. Ross says:

"God has a great deal to do before he is ready for emancipation. He tells us so by this *arrest* put upon that tendency to emancipation years ago. For He put it into the hearts of abolitionists *to make the arrest*. And He stopped the Southern movement all the more perfectly by permitting Great Britain to emancipate Jamaica, and letting that experiment prove, as it has, a perfect failure and a terrible warning. JAMAICA IS DESTROYED.† And now, whatever be done for its negroes must be done with the full admission that what has been attempted was in violation of the duty Britain owed to those negroes."—p. 72.

The only remedy for these admitted evils and failures is slavery:—slavery under the protection of the laws of a Christian land; slavery in the hands of mild Christian masters; slavery in such circumstances that the African can be trained for freedom; slavery with no purpose of *immediate* emancipation, with no definite arrangements *for* emancipation, with no *time* fixed for emancipation, where the whole subject of the future liberty of the slave shall be left to the development of things, and the indications of the divine will;—to arrangements above and beyond the wisdom of men. Thus Dr. Ross says:

* Southern Quarterly Review for April, 1857.
† The capitals are Dr. Ross'.

"Let us, then, North and South, bring our minds to comprehend *two ideas*, and submit to their irresistible power. Let the Northern philanthropist learn from the Bible that the relation of master and slave is not sin *per se*. Let him learn that God nowhere says it is sin. Let him learn that sin is the transgression of the law; and where there is no law, there is no sin; and that *the golden rule* may exist in the relations of slavery. Let him learn that slavery is simply an evil *in certain circumstances*. Let him learn that *equality* is only the highest form of social life; that *subjection* to authority, even *slavery*, may, in *given conditions*, be, *for a time* BETTER THAN FREEDOM TO THE SLAVE OF ANY COMPLEXION. Let him learn, that *slavery*, like *all evils*, has its *corresponding* and *greater good;* that the Southern slave, though degraded *compared with his master*, is *elevated* and *ennobled compared with his brethren in Africa*. Let the Northern man learn these things, and be wise to cultivate the spirit that will harmonize with his brethren of the South, who are lovers of liberty as truly as himself. And let the Southern Christian—nay, the Southern man of every grade—believe that slavery, although not a sin, is a degraded condition,—the evil, the curse on the South,—yet, having blessings in its time to the South and to the Union. Let him know that slavery is to pass away, in the fulness of Providence. Let the South believe this, and prepare to obey the hand that moves their destiny."—pp. 28, 29, 30.

It seems that it is a great law, in order to the elevation of any portion of the human race which is sunken and degraded, that it should be brought in contact with a superior and more elevated race. Man never rises himself from a state of low degradation, ignorance, and abasement. The arts of civilized life, and the blessings of religion must be *carried* to the debased and the degraded on their own soil, or they who are debased and degraded must be *brought* from their own land, and placed in close contact with those who are more elevated. Thus it has been in the spread of the arts of civil-

ized life in all the past periods of the world, and it is on this principle that the Christian church is now engaged in the laborious effort of *carrying* the gospel to the benighted tribes of men. But it has been demonstrated that, unlike other people, the best way for elevating the *African* race, is to place them in that very close connection which is implied in the idea of servitude with a superior race, and eminently with the Anglo-Saxon. The Africans are, as they are found in their own land, like children. They are simple; harmless; teachable, and capable of *being* elevated, but it must be as dependents—as menials—as slaves—as children not yet qualified to guide themselves. They want a long course of discipline, teaching, government, before they will be qualified to govern themselves. They need the exercise of a mild and paternal *authority* over them administered by those of a superior race, who can thus qualify them for the important position which they *may* yet occupy in the world. The best mode of training such minds is that indicated by slavery—where they shall be under others; where they shall be in a school of discipline; where the lash shall enforce the lessons of moral admonition, and carry the instructions of wisdom to the heart; where the waywardness of an untutored and savage, though teachable nature, shall be subdued by hard and incessant toil, and where the restraints connected with the idea that they can never hold property so as to ruin themselves by self-indulgence shall lead their thoughts to higher interests, and teach them to aspire after the blessings which they see in other hands. Hence it is, that since the introduction of slavery into our own land, though it cannot be denied that it has

been attended with many evils and hardships, the race has been gradually and slowly, but certainly rising, till they have now reached a position in which in intelligence, in morals, in industrious habits, in grace of manners, and in religion, they are immeasurably in advance of the native Africans. The native African has never risen on his own soil to the elevation now occupied in these respects by the slaves in the United States, and the influence of the relation, therefore, on their gentle and tractable minds, has been of the happiest and most desirable character. Thus Dr. Ross says of the Southern master:

"His obligation is high, and great, and glorious. It is the same obligation, in kind, he is under to his wife and children, and in some respects immensely higher, by reason of the number and the tremendous interests involved for time and eternity in connection with this great country, Africa, and the world. Yes, sir, *I know*, whether Southern masters fully know it or not, that *they hold from God*, individually and collectively, *the highest and the noblest responsibility ever given by Him to individual private men on all the face of the earth. For God has intrusted to them to train millions of the most degraded in form and intellect, but, at the same time, the most gentle, the most amiable, the most affectionate, the most imitative, the most susceptible of social and religious love*, of all the races of mankind,—to train them, and to give them civilization, and the light and the life of the gospel of Jesus Christ. And I thank God he has given this great work to that type of the noble family of Japheth best qualified to do it,—to the Cavalier stock,—the gentleman and the lady of England and France, born to command, and softened and refined under our Southern sky." —pp. 67, 68.

So also Mr. Calhoun:

"It may, indeed, safely be asserted, that there is no example in history in which a savage people, such as their ancestors were

when brought to this country, have ever advanced in the same period so rapidly in numbers and improvement."*

It is through this contact with minds of a higher order, and of those more advanced in civilization, and by this only, that we can hope that the African race will ever be elevated.

The only question of practical difficulty is, whether this can best be done in this country or in Africa itself; whether by removing a portion of the African race to a Christian land, that they may there receive the benefits of the system that is to raise and elevate them, or whether this great experiment would not be likely to be crowned with better success ultimately, and be attended by fewer incidental evils, if it were to be made in their native land, and on the native soil of the African race; whether, instead of bringing the African to this land and making him a slave for the sake of civilization and ultimate elevation, it would not be better that those to whom the work of elevating the race seems to be entrusted should make Africa itself the field of the great experiment; whether, in one word, it would not be better for a number of Southern masters—a number sufficiently large to secure success to the experiment, but not so great as to withdraw the influence necessary to civilize and Christianize those already here—to go to Africa and establish slavery there in a better form than that in which it now prevails, and diffuse there the blessings of the system as developed here. In the nature of the case, there seems to be no reason why a system which has done so much for the African race in

* Works, vol. v. p. 204.

this country, should not be attended with equal benefit there; why that which has transformed the ignorant, the degraded, and the barbarous—which has made the heathen negro an industrious and faithful servant and a sincere and humble Christian—which has made him acquainted with the resources and the arts of civilized life, should not be attended with equal results in that land. By this plan, also, many of the incidental evils which have grown out of the great experiment, as thus far made, would be avoided—evils which it has been difficult to separate wholly from the experiment. The expense of importing them to this land; the sufferings, which are often very great, caused by the forcible separation of the African from what to him is his country; the privations endured in the passage across the ocean, in what has been called "the horrors of the middle passage;" the separation of husbands and wives, and parents and children, perhaps unavoidable, in their removal to this land; and the dangers which now exist in our own country from the sectional strifes, the embittered feelings, the struggle for power, the fear of insurrection, and the apprehension of a disunion of the States in this Republic, and which must increase more and more in proportion as slavery is extended here: all these evils, which are so often now alluded to as incidental to slavery, and which are so often urged as arguments against the system, would be avoided.

Instead, therefore, of the Colonization Society, which has proved to be so abortive, and which can never accomplish the object contemplated by its benevolent founders; instead of attempting to elevate the African race by the slow and expensive process of removing

them to our shores; instead of further periling our own liberty, by the sectional controversies, and the agitations which grow out of the existence of slavery, and which it will be impossible ever wholly to suppress, let a sufficient number of colonists, composed of Southern masters, headed by Christian ministers, transfer the field of the great experiment to Africa itself. Let Christian men—familiar with the details of the system, and accustomed to train and direct the imported African by means of slavery, attended with all the appliances of the Gospel and of civilization—plant colonies along the coast of Africa, and making their way into the interior, ultimately diffuse the blessings of Christian bondage over that entire dark continent. In the execution of a scheme so benevolent, and that promises so much for the good of our own country, it would not be too much to hope that all the people of this land might become ultimately interested, and that even the resources and wealth of the National Government—which has, in fact, never shown itself adverse to any well-conceived plan for extending the blessings of slavery—might be hoped ultimately to become its patron. In such a scheme, too, Africa might rejoice in the assurance that she was at length to see the ultimate reason—the final cause—why she has suffered so much in ages past; in such a scheme, every philanthropic Southern master—minister or layman—embracing the views of Dr. Ross, would have an approving conscience in the conviction that, amidst meritorious sacrifices and self-denials, he was promoting the good of his country and the salvation of Africa.

With a view to such results, these reflections are now

submitted to the public. For the promotion of truth; for the diffusion of just views of the interpretation of the Bible; for the elevation of the African race, and for the good of the slaves, it is eminently desirable that the work of Dr. Ross should receive the widest possible circulation. No book has appeared in our country that is better adapted to promote just views of slavery, and to secure the best interests of the African race; and few works have been published better fitted to guide reflecting minds as to the proper method of conducting missions, than the tract of Bishop Colenso; and it is with a view of promoting their wider circulation that these remarks have been penned; that so large a part of the work of Dr. Ross has been extracted, and that the tract of the Bishop of Natal is printed entire—that by their being brought into close connection the true nature of the arguments in each may be better seen, and both be so presented that the one may derive support from the other.

REMARKS

On the Proper Treatment of Cases of Polygamy, as found already existing in Converts from Heathenism. By JOHN WILLIAM COLENSO, D. D., *Lord Bishop of Natal.* Printed by May & Davis, Church street, Pietermaritzburg, 1855.

Having observed in the Natal journals of late, some articles on the subject of polygamy, which require, I think, a reply from those who have given more serious attention to the question than the writers of the said articles appear generally to have done, I have thought it proper to set on paper the following observations:

I need scarcely say that as a Christian, and more especially as a Member and Minister of the Church of England, believing that the holy estate of Matrimony represents to us in a mystery the "Spiritual Marriage and Union which exists betwixt Christ and His Church," I am not likely to have said anything, in my *Ten Weeks*, or elsewhere, to invalidate the sanctity of marriage, or to represent the state of polygamy as in any way desirable or commendable. I believe, of course, that the practice is at variance with the whole spirit of Christianity, and must eventually be rooted out by it, wherever it comes. And I believe that it is our duty, as Christian men and Ministers, to aim at its extirpation among the natives of this land, as speedily as possible.

But I certainly expressed a doubt, in my published Journal, whether the method, at present adopted by the Missionaries, of requiring a man, who had more than one wife, to put away all but one before he could be received to Christian Baptism, was the *right* way of accomplishing this end. I have since given much closer consideration to the question, and I have now no hesitation in saying, that I believe the above-mentioned rule to be unwarranted by Scripture, opposed to the practice of the Apostles, condemned by common reason, and altogether unjustifiable.

I could wish that the communications hitherto made upon the subject, (with the exception of one by my friend, Dr. Bleek, in the last *Natal Mercury*,) had contained less of declamation and more of argu-

ment. It is most desirable that a question of such grave importance to the progress of our missionary work among the heathen, and through that, to the whole colony, should be dispassionately considered. Of course, I most fully believe that those who have expressed themselves so strongly on the matter, have acted conscientiously, because they *felt* strongly, and thought they were really serving the interests of religion and morality by the vehement protests they were making. I have some hope that they will be compelled to confess that they have judged hastily and rashly, and have written more harshly upon the matter than the truth required; and, at all events, that there is far higher and stronger authority for the view which I take of this question than they had at all imagined. And, as for my brethren the Missionaries, who doubtless have acted from the best and purest motives, in the course they have hitherto pursued, I shall be thankful to receive any results of their own experience which may tend either to correct or to confirm more decisively the conviction to which I have now arrived.

I wish first to consider what guidance the Scriptures afford us on this matter.

There is, of course, no question that the practice of polygamy was not only tolerated among the Jews, but even sanctioned by the examples of eminent and pious men among them, and, in one instance, by the words of a Prophet, uttering a direct message from the Almighty. For, not to mention other cases, that will readily occur to the reader, we have those of Abraham, "the father of the faithful," and David, the "man after God's own heart," who were both polygamists; so that, certainly, it is possible that the practice should coexist with a very high degree of moral excellence and holiness of life. Again, we have the passage of Deuteronomy, which distinctly recognizes polygamy, as freely permitted among the Jewish people:

> If a man have two wives, one beloved and another hated, and they have borne him children, both the beloved and the hated, and if the first-born son be her's that was hated, then it shall be, when he maketh his sons to inherit that which he hath, that he may not make the son of the beloved first-born before the son of the hated, which is, indeed, the first-born.—DEUT. xxi. 15, 16.

And this was addressed to the nation who had received an express Command from the Mouth of the Living God—"Thou shalt not commit adultery;" and with whom, in fact, the crime of adultery was punished with death. It is plain, already from this, that the mere fact of living with more lawful wives than one, does not, in itself, constitute the *crime* or *sin* of adultery.

And, once more, we have the words of the Prophet Nathan to David, in which he speaks of the possession of his predecessor's wives as an express blessing from the Almighty:

> Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, "I gave thee thy Master's house, and thy Master's wives into thy bosom."—2 Sam. xii. 8.

It is true that in Deut. xvii. 17, the future Kings of Israel are forbidden to "multiply wives to themselves." But this refers only to the excessive multiplication of wives; for it is added, in the same context, "Neither shall he multiply to himself horses"—"Neither shall he greatly multiply to himself silver and gold."

We now come to the times of the New Testament. And here it is necessary to remark, (what is generally unnoticed by those who hastily argue on this subject,) that the Jews, in our Lord's time and after it, were decided polygamists. Thus Justin Martyr, one of the earliest apologists of the Christian Church, in his famous dialogue with Trypho, the Jew, speaks (c. 134) of

> The foolish and blind teachers of his people, who even until now allow each man to have as many as four or five wives at a time.

And again (c. 141) he speaks of a man's

> Taking to himself, as wives, *whom* he would, and *how* he would, and as *many* as he would, such as men of your [the Jewish] nation do, who, in every part of the world, wherever they have come or are sent, take to themselves women, under the name of matrimony.

Some of their great Masters, it is true, laid down the law that no one should marry more than *four* wives; but Maimonides, one of their most famous Rabbis, (quoted by Jebb, in his Notes on the above passage of Justin Martyr,) says:

> It is lawful for a man to marry any number of wives, even a hundred, whether all together or one after another; nor has the first-married wife any power of hindering this, provided he has the means of supporting them.

The last quotation leads me to speak of the practice of *divorce*, which, as is well known, was very common among the Jews; for when Maimonides speaks of a man marrying a hundred wives, one after another, he does not mean that he shall, after the death of one marry another, and so on—but by *divorcing* one after another. In fact, the practice of divorce was carried by the Jews to a frightful extent.

"Among them," says Dr. Adam Clarke, "a man might put away his wife, if she displeased him even in the dressing of his victuals." And he quotes the cases of Rabbi Akibe and the famous historian Josephus—of whom the former said:

> If any man saw a woman handsomer than his own wife, he might put his wife away, because it is said in the Law—"If she find not favor in his eyes," &c.

And the latter, who lived in the days of our Lord himself, tells us, in his autobiography, with great coolness:

> About this time I put away my wife, *who had borne me three children*, not being pleased with her manners.

It may serve further to illustrate this subject, if I copy the form of a "Writing of Divorce," among the Jews:

I, A. B., &c., with entire consent of mind, and without any compulsion, have divorced, dismissed, and expelled thee, C. D., &c., who wast heretofore my wife; but now I have dismissed thee so as to be free, and at thine own disposal, to marry whomsoever thou pleasest, without hindrance from any one, from this day forever. Let this be thy bill of divorce from me, a writing of separation and expulsion, according to the Law of Moses and Israel.

Now, I say distinctly, it was against this practice of divorce, and not against that of polygamy, that our blessed Lord's words were directed. I know, indeed, that the spirit of His Divine teaching, is, throughout, indirectly subversive of the practice of polygamy—that the inevitable result of receiving Christianity, into the heart of a people, must be to abolish it. But though, among those addressed by our Lord, there must have been men with more than one wife, He never condemns this as sinful and displeasing in God's sight. It is the *putting* away of one wife to marry another—the more usual and economical way of practicing polygamy—it is this which is condemned by him. He says nothing whatever on the subject of polygamy itself; though, indirectly, he teaches the true lesson of married life, when he asks:

Have ye not read that He which made them at the beginning, made them male and female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they twain shall be one flesh?

The passages in which our Lord is reported to have spoken on this subject, are the following:

Matth. v. 31, 32.—It hath been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement: But I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causes her to commit adultery; and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced, committeth adultery.

The divorce is unlawful; it is no divorce in God's sight; the man and his wife are still married.

Let it be remembered that these words were spoken among a people who actually practiced polygamy, and had it expressly allowed among them by a Divine law; and it will be obvious what a momentous question it raises for Missionaries in their dealings with Kafir converts. Does not a Kafir man, who puts away his wife, except for the sake of fornication, *cause her to commit adultery?* And dare we be responsible for recommending this act? I, for one, dare not—no, not even if the wife were content, upon strong persuasion, to leave her husband. They are lawfully married. I dare not be concerned in parting them, or in advising the man to let her go "free, and at her own disposal, to marry whomsoever she pleases."

Matt. xix. 8.—He saith unto them, Moses, because of the hardness of your hearts, suffered you to *put away your wives*.

I observe that the article copied into some of the Natal papers, from the *Cape Town Commercial Advertiser*, argues as if, instead of the above, it had been said, "Moses, for the hardness of your

hearts, suffered you to *have more than one wife;* whereas, as we have seen, the practice of polygamy was sanctioned in the case of Abraham and Jacob, long before the time of Moses, and the "hardness of heart" of the Jewish people.

But from the beginning it was not so. And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery; and whosoever marrieth her that is put away, doth commit adultery.

Here we have the words added, "and shall marry another." But, evidently, these words do not contain the essence of the sin; it is not the man who "marries another" wife, but he who "puts away his wife and marries another," that is here said to commit adultery.

These words, "and shall marry another," indicate the *reason* for which the wife was most commonly put away in those days—viz: in order that the husband might marry another, but save the expense of maintaining two wives.

Of course the reader will not suspect me of saying that our blessed Lord meant to *sanction* or *approve* of polygamy. I assert only, that in these words, He does not condemn it. He pronounces no judgment whatever upon it.

Mark x. 11, 12.—He saith unto them, Whosoever shall put away his wife, and marry another, committeth adultery against her; and if a woman shall put away her husband, and be married to another, she committeth adultery.

We have nearly the same words as the last, but with an additional clause affecting the woman. By Jewish law, a woman could not put away her husband. Probably the Roman law was at this time in force among the Jews.

Luke xvi. 18.—Whosoever putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery; and whosoever marrieth her that is put away from her husband, committeth adultery.

Here, again, the crime of adultery is constituted, on the husband's side, by the double offence of *putting away* and *marrying another*. But he that marries her that is put away, "commits adultery."

These, I believe, are all the passages in our Lord's discourses that bear at all upon the question.

We come now to the writings of the Apostles; and the first passage which meets us, as applicable to the present question, is that of St. Paul to the Corinthians:

1 Cor. vii. 12.—If any brother hath a wife that believeth not, and she be pleased to dwell with him, let him not put her away.

If the state of polygamy was, in any sense, tolerated by the Apostles, when they found it existing in those whom they converted to

Christianity, these would seem to be very serious words for those who command every brother that hath wives more than one, to put them all away, whether they be believers or not; and though they may not only be pleased, but thoroughly resolved, from strong and old attachment, to live and die with him. Let us examine, then, further into the subject.

In 1 Tim. iii. 2, we find it laid down by St. Paul, in his directions to Timothy for the choice of Ministers for Ordination, that

> A Bishop* must be blameless, the husband of one wife.

And again, verse 12—

> Let the Deacons be the husband of one wife.

Now the Roman-Catholic commentators understand these words to mean, that a Bishop or Deacon should only once be married; and the Roman-Catholic Church has refined the Apostle's direction into the rule, that the Clergy should not marry at all; as if there were something unholy and unclean in marriage, which our Lord Himself "adorned and beautified with His Presence, and first miracle, that he wrought in Cana of Galilee!"

The Protestant commentators unanimously reject this interpretation. They understand the words to speak of *not admitting to Church Offices* any, who had *more wives than one at a time*. From this it would appear that *some were admitted to Baptism*, who had more wives than one, and yet were not required to put away all but one, on embracing Christianity. For, if it had been laid down as a distinct and positive rule, that no *polygamist* should be received to Baptism, the direction in the text would be futile and absurd.

Let the reader mark this well. Polygamy was a *state* of life—a *permanent* condition—not a temporary, occasional condition, in which the man might be found to-day, but not to-morrow. Thus a man might be subject to fits of passion, or of drunkenness; but they would be no bar to his becoming a Christian. Rather, if he were sincere in his desire to get the better of all this evil, he would be encouraged to seek the strength of God, by coming to Holy Baptism. Nor, should he afterwards be overtaken in a fault, and be overcome by his besetting sin, would he, therefore, be at once excommunicated or expelled from the Church.

But, if polygamy be pronounced positively *sinful* in itself, without regard being had to the state of moral culture and civilization, in which a man has hitherto been living, it would be a complete bar to his being received into the Church at all. And the Apostles might more rationally have written: "Let not a Bishop or a Deacon be chosen from those, who are *habitual drunkards*, or *open adulterers*," because such *might* have been found within the pale of the Church—but a polygamist, *never*.

* The word "Bishop," in this passage, and throughout the New Testament, is used as synonymous with Presbyter or Priest.

Whoever, then, admits that these words of St. Paul are intended to exclude from the Ministry those, who, according to the practice of the Jews, and almost all Oriental nations, (and he was here writing to Timothy at Ephesus), were then *actually living with more wives than one*, must admit also, that the practice of polygamy, however objectionable, was not yet absolutely forbidden among laymen, for those who had more than one wife, when first converted.

The sense of this difficulty, and the unwillingness to allow of the possibility of polygamy having been suffered to exist, even for a season, in the primitive Church, have led some commentators to explain these words, as referring solely to the exclusion from the Ministry of those, who had *put away* one or more wives, though living now only with one. And this, in fact, would be the case of many a convert now-a-days in this land, if the rule of the Missionaries were enforced—supposing, that is, converts to be gained at all among the wealthier and higher class of natives.

The following extracts, however, will probably be sufficient to satisfy the English reader, that this is but a forced explanation of the passage, and one not approved by some of the ablest interpreters.

And, first, we have Whitby, a Divine of the Church of England:—

The husband of one wife.—"For the Jews and Greeks," saith Theodoret, "were wont to be married to two or three wives together." I approve of this interpretation of some of the ancients, which is also mentioned by Jerome and by Chrysostom, declaring that the Apostle doth not here *oblige* the Bishop to be married, but only corrects the immoderatoness of some, and because, among the Jews, it was lawful both to marry twice, and to have two wives together, and it was more common with them to divorce one and take another. And, whereas against this interpretation it is objected, that the Apostle requires also that the widow should be the "wife of one husband," whereas it was never permitted, among any but barbarians, for women to have more than one husband at once;—this objection hath some strength against interpreting this latter passage of polygamy, but none against that interpretation, which relates to marriage after dismission of the former husband.—Comm. on 1 Tim. iii. 2.

We may next quote the Rev. John Wesley's remarks, upon the same place of Scripture:—

The husband of one wife.—"This neither means that a Bishop *must* be married, nor that he *may not* marry a second wife, which it is just as lawful for him to do as to marry the first, and may, in some cases, be his bounden duty. But whereas *polygamy*, and *divorce* on slight occasions, were common, both among the Jews and heathens, it teaches us that *Ministers*, of all others, ought to stand clear of those sins."

John Wesley, then, admits that the passage refers to *polygamy* as well as *divorce;* and from this the conclusion follows irresistibly, as I have before shown, that he admits the possibility of persons being found in the Church who were polygamists, though such must be excluded from the Ministry. It must be confessed, however, that John Wesley's views on the subject of polygamy were much stronger than Whitby's. He here calls the practice a "sin;" and in one of his letters, thirty years later, he writes:—

I totally deny that (supposed) matter of fact, that polygamy was allowed among

the primitive Christians, or that the converts, who had many wives, were not required to put any of them away.

Nevertheless, this conclusion appears to me to follow necessarily from his previous admission.

In the above two instances, the inference I have drawn is only consequential upon the comment of the annotator. But the following testimonies are of a more direct kind; and proceeding, as they do, from men of high character for piety and ability, who wrote in the calm and quiet of their studies, far removed from the scenes and circumstances, which might distract our judgment here upon the spot, with only the word of God before them, and, as they prayed and believed, the Spirit of Truth to guide them, they are very impressive words, in their bearing on the present controversy.

The Rev. Thomas Scott, M.A., well known to most readers, as an eminent Divine of the (so-called) Evangelical School of the Church of England, in his practical commentary on 1 Tim. iii. 2, writes as follows:—

Some have endeavoured to infer a part of that (the Roman-Catholic) system from this clause, and have supposed that the Apostle meant to prohibit second marriages to the clergy. But this is contrary to the whole tenor of Scripture. It is by no means contained in the meaning of the words, and would certainly bring in a part of those evils, which long experience has found inseparable from the general prohibition. For as good reasons may often be given for marrying a second wife as for marrying at all.

With respect to the subject now under consideration, he says:—

He (a Bishop) ought also to be the "husband of one wife." Christ and the Apostles expressly condemned polygamy, as well as divorce, except for adultery.

He refers to the passages in St. Matthew and St. Mark, which I have already quoted, and have shown, as I believe, that they *do not* "expressly condemn," or pronounce any judgment on the question of, polygamy.

Yet there was no direct command for a man, who had previously taken more wives than one, to put the others away when he embraced the Gospel; and such a requisition might, in some instances, have produced very bad consequences in domestic life, and increased the opposition of the civil powers to the preaching of Christianity. But the rule that no man, however qualified in other respects, should be admitted into the pastoral Office, who had more than one wife, or who had put away one to take another, tended to show the unlawfulness of polygamy and divorces on frivolous pretences, and their inconsistency with the Christian dispensation; and concurred, with other things, to bring them into total disuse in the Christian Church, yet WITHOUT VIOLENCE AND CONFUSION.

No one, who knows anything of Mr. Scott's history, will suppose for a moment that he was a man, who would either have shrunk himself, or permitted others under his teaching to shrink, from taking up manfully any "Cross," which the profession of the Gospel properly laid upon them. It was because he felt, as I also feel with him, that the putting away of wives, with whom marriage has been contracted before

the reception of the Gospel, is *not* according to the Mind of God and the Spirit of Christ's Religion, that he wrote as above. At the same time, I heartily concur with the following words of the same Divine, with which he closes the above-quoted passage:—

To argue hence, as it has been done, that polygamy was *lawful* for other Christians, else it would not have been needful to restrict Pastors from it, would prove (if it proved anything) that it was also lawful and common for them to be drunkards, covetous, brawlers, or strikers.

It was *not* lawful for other Christians; it was, no doubt, expressly forbidden, as I desire it should be, that any, *after Christian Baptism*, should commit in any form the offence of polygamy.

I next quote from Dr. James Macknight, an eminent commentator on the Gospels and the Apostolic Epistles, belonging to the Presbyterian Church of Scotland:—

The husband of one wife.—That the Gospel allows women to marry a second time, is evident from 1 Cor. vii. 9, 39. By parity of reason it allows men to marry a second time likewise. Wherefore, when it is said here that "a Bishop must be the husband of one wife," and 1 Tim. v. 9, that the widow, who is employed by the Church, in teaching the young of her own sex the principles of the Christian Religion, must have been the "wife of one husband," the Apostle could not mean that persons, who have married a second time, are thereby disqualified for sacred offices. His meaning, therefore, in those canons, is, that such persons only are to be entrusted with sacred offices, who, in their married state, have contented themselves with one wife, and with one husband, at a time. As the Asiatic nations universally practised polygamy, the Apostle, to bring back mankind to use marriage according to the primitive institution, which enjoined one man to be united to *one woman* only at a time, ordered by inspiration that none should be made Bishops, but those who had shown themselves temperate, by avoiding polygamy. In like manner, because, according to Our Lord's determination, persons, who divorced each other unjustly, were guilty of adultery, when they married themselves to others—also, because such really had more wives and husbands than one at a time, as was the case with the woman of Samaria—the Apostle to restrain these licentious practices, which were common among the Greeks and Romans, as well as among the Jews, ordered that no widow should be chosen to instruct the younger women, but such as had been the "wife of one husband" only at a time.

It may be objected, perhaps, that the Gospel ought to have prohibited the *people*, as well as the *Ministers of Religion*, from polygamy and divorce, if these things were morally evil. As to *divorce*, the answer is that, by the precept of Christ, all, both clergy and people, *were* restrained from unjust divorces. And with respect to *polygamy*, being an offence against political prudence rather than against morality, it had been permitted to the Jews by Moses, Dent. xxi. 15, on account of the hardness of their hearts, and was generally practised by the Eastern nations, as a matter of indifference. *It was, therefore, to be corrected mildly and gradually, by example, rather than by express precept. And, seeing reformation must begin somewhere, it was certainly fit to begin with the Ministers of Religion; that, through the influence of their example, the evil might be remedied by disuse, without occasioning those* DOMESTIC TROUBLES AND CAUSELESS DIVORCES, *which must necessarily have ensued, if, by an express injunction of the Apostles, husbands, immediately on their becoming Christians, had been obliged to put away all their wives except one.* Accordingly, the example of the Clergy, and of such of the brethren as were not married at their conversion, or who were married only to one woman, supported by the precepts of the Gospel, had so effectually rooted out polygamy from the Church, that the Emperor Valentinian, to give countenance to his marrying Justina, during the life of his wife, Severa, whom he would not divorce, publishes a law, permitting his subjects to have two wives at a time.

It will be seen that I do not agree with this Divine, in thinking that

polygamy was allowed to the Jews by Moses "for the hardness of their hearts," because I find it already practised by their great forefather Abraham, who was called the "Friend of God." Nor do I either agree with him in considering polygamy to be "an offence against political prudence, rather than against morality." I believe it to be an offence against morality and Christianity,—a thing to be deprecated denounced, and done away; but though an *offence*, not necessarily, therefore, a *sin* in the sight of God, and an offence not to be got rid of by the summary process (as I consider it) of cruel injustice, and outrage on the highest principles both of morality and religion, which, at present, is usually recommended in such cases.

I will next produce the authority of John Calvin:—

The husband of one wife.—The only true exposition of those words is that of Chrysostom, that polygamy is here expressly condemned in a Bishop, which, at that time, had almost become a law among the Jews. They practised this, partly, from a perverse imitation of their fathers; for reading that Abraham, Jacob, David, and the like, were married to many wives at once, they considered that this was allowable for themselves also; and partly, they contracted this corrupt habit from the neighbouring nations; for among Orientals, marriages were never reverenced with becoming sanctity and good faith. However this may be, polygamy had become generally prevalent among them. And so it is not without reason that Paul forbids this stain from the character of a Bishop. Nor do I condemn the opinion of those, who think that the Holy Spirit wished here to meet and oppose that diabolical superstition, which crept on afterwards, as if he had said, "So far from its being right that Bishops should be compelled to practice celibacy, the state of matrimony becomes even the most pious"—those, namely, who are to be chosen for ministers. In this way he would be understood not as *requiring* marriage in them, as a thing absolutely necessary, but only *commending* it, as a state by no means unworthy of the dignity of the ministerial office. It is more simple, however, and certain, to hold, as I have already said, that polygamy is here repelled by St. Paul from the Episcopal order, because it is a sign of lust and unfaithfulness.

Here, however, it is objected, that, what is vicious in all, ought not to have been condemned or prohibited in Bishops only. The answer is easy—that *license* is not, on this account, given forthwith to *others*, because this is expressly *forbidden* in *Bishops*. Nor can we have any doubt that Paul condemned generally what was repugnant with the eternal Law of God. For the decree is fixed and sure—"They two shall be one flesh." *But he might, however, have endured in others what, in a Bishop, would have been too disgraceful and intolerable. For this law is not laid down for posterity, so that no Bishop, who has one wife, should marry a second or a third; but Paul repels all from the Episcopal order, who have committed such an offence. And so, compelled by necessity, he bears with that which, being already done, could not be corrected—but only in the common laity.* FOR WHAT REMEDY WAS THERE? SHOULD THOSE HAVE PUT AWAY THEIR SECOND AND THIRD WIVES, WHO HAD ENTERED INTO A STATE OF POLYGAMY UNDER THE JEWISH DISPENSATION? BUT SUCH A REPUDIATION WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN WITHOUT WRONG AND INJUSTICE. He left untouched, therefore, what was not new and entirely in his own power (*quod integrum non erat,*) and only provided that no Bishop should be soiled with such a stain.

Once more. Peter Martyr, one of the great continental Reformers, in his *Loci Communes*, (quoted in the *Colonial Church Chronicle* for June, 1854,) puts the question—

If an Infidel were in our day converted to Christ, having two wives, could such polygamy be endured under the Christian dispensation? And his answer is—*Certainly, for the time. For they contracted with each other in good faith. Nor must a wrong be done to the wives, for each of them has a claim upon her husband. That law, however, which Christ gave, ought to hold for the future. But what has been done, and done with good faith, probably in ignorance, cannot be rescinded.*

I have said enough, I trust, to show that those, who think with me on this matter, are not lightly to be charged with "betraying our Divine Master, like Judas, with a kiss." And I hope I may now obtain a calm and unprejudiced hearing, for the arguments from reason and common sense, with which I would still further maintain the ground I have taken.

I say, then, with Calvin, that, in compelling a Kafir husband to put away his wives, we are doing a positive "wrong," perhaps to the man himself, but certainly to the woman, whom he is compelled to divorce. We do wrong to the man's own moral principle—his sense of right and justice—his feelings as a husband and a man. He knows that he is under a solemn obligation, ratified by the laws and customs of his people, to those whom he has taken for wives. He knows that they have lived and laboured for him, it may be, for years—have borne him children—have shared the joys and sorrows of family life. For a Kafir has a feeling of family and home. It is an outrageous slander upon the character of these poor natives, to say that they are void of affection—that their wives are merely their slaves, their children so many conveniences, for raising money by the labor of the one sex, and accumulating cattle by the sale of the other. They have their sense of duty as well as we, in their different relations of parent, husband, brother, child; and if Jacob, though a polygamist, had not, therefore all his feelings blunted,—(witness his tender passion for Rachel, and his love for Joseph and Benjamin)—what right have we to assume that the practice of polygamy has degraded and debased our own poor Zulus beneath the level of the brute? Let me here tell a tale of the last flight of refugees, which bears, perhaps, somewhat on this question.

There came an old man and woman, with their son and daughter, to the banks of the Tugela; a man of their acquaintance, and two other women, came also and joined the party. None of them had strength sufficient to wade through the stream except the son of the two old people. With his own stout arm and skill, he carried over safely by night each of the other six. The stream was deep and strong, the alligators numerous, the terrible Zulu butchers in the rear, who stabbed some defenceless women of the main body before they reached the river banks. But God watched over the little company. Twelve times the young man waded across; and, one after another, father, mother, sister, and friends, they were all brought safe to shore, and landed on the British territory. They began to mount the heights which border the stream, exulting in their deliverance, when the plaintive howl of a dog was heard from the opposite bank. It was the young swimmer's own poor hound. It had missed its master, and could not swim: but he must not leave it behind. In vain were the entreaties of his family, urging upon him the hazard he would run, from his own state of exhaustion, the alligators in the river, and the spears of the pursuers upon the farther shore. The young man loved his dog, and pacified his friends, and once more plunged into the stream. But ere he had reached halfway, watched from the shore he left with longing eyes, he uttered a shriek, and, lifting up his arm, he

was heard to shout, "And must I then perish thus?" An alligator had seized him, and he was seen no more. The poor mother, in her frantic grief, reproached her daughter with the loss of her dear son. "It was she who had persuaded them to make this escape." The daughter was so distressed at these words, that she swallowed three of the poisonous caddis-worms, so commonly hanging upon the trees in this country, with the intention of destroying herself. But proper remedies were applied by the natives, who came down to help the fugitives, and she was ultimately restored.

Who shall tell us, after such a story as this, (for which Mr. Shepstone is my authority), that a Kafir has no share in the common feelings of humanity, and that he is not deeply sensible of the wrong done to his affections, by the sacrifice which is demanded of him, as the very test of his acceptance of Christianity? But what a fearful wrong must be done at the same time, to the sense of *justice?* It is easy to say, as some have said, that the Gospel requires the sacrifice of father, mother, wife, or child, if need be, in the service of Christ. But I boldly assert, that *this* is not such a sacrifice as the Gospel requires. If, indeed, the heathen wife, however dear to his affections, should refuse to live with him any longer, when he becomes a Christian—if he knows that his parents and her parents will cast him off, his very children be taught to hate him, and his name be forgotten among his kindred, and in his tribe—then, indeed, there would be a true trial of his faith, and he would have to make his choice between cleaving to Christ and his nearest and dearest earthly friends. And for this he would be prepared. There would be nothing abhorrent to the first principles of justice in this. Nor, if a Christian convert were told that, being unmarried, he must marry only in the Lord, or being married, he must add no more to the number of his wives, would there be anything in this to shock or to offend him. His own conscience would support the dictum of his Teacher.

But the conscience of a man must revolt *at first* from the present practice, however fearfully it may become blunted *at last*, by perpetual reiteration of the law of the Mission Station, and the (supposed) Will of the Almighty. The man, if he thinks at all, must be utterly bewildered between the sense of his duty to God, (or rather to the Teacher, who has become as it were, a God to him, and is framing anew for him his standard of right and wrong,) and the dictates of his own heart and mind, which tell him so truly, that, whatever he may be willing to do to secure his soul's salvation, he has no right to sacrifice his wives, their feelings, their marriage-bonds, their rights, and the rights of their children. For who shall marry them again? They have already grown old in his service. Their youth and comeliness are gone. They have their children it is true; and with these are they to be cast forth like Hagar into the desert, to become suppliants for the charity of the first compassionate wayfaring Kafir? Or is the Christian husband to pension them off, with the help of Mission Funds, (as I have heard was the case under a certain missionary, no longer in the colony,) and to keep them in his neighborhood, within the reach of his counsel and assistance, for the management and training of his children, compelled to live separate from other

men, but as wives of his no longer, not even in name? Or is the *husband* to take possession of all the children? and is the wife to go, like her of whom I have written in my journal, to tell the story of her woe to the missionary,—"You have not only taken my husband from me, but my child also!" And these things are done in the name of Christianity? And this is one of the very first notices, which the heathens are to receive, of the working of that Gospel, which was to be "glad tidings of great joy to all people?"

I verily believe, that, in consequence mainly of the enforcement of this rule, our blessed religion already *stinks in the nostrils of this people.* It is not the purity, the charity, the piety, which it enjoins—it is not this, which makes the native shrink, with dislike and distrust, from the very first approach of a Missionary. The heart within them will confess to the excellency of these things; their spirit will respond to the Law of God that it is good, even when the flesh refuses to obey it. But here the mind of the savage—the best instincts of his nature—his regard for the sanctity of marriage, for the peace and welfare of his family—take part with his ignorance and evil passions in repelling the advances of the Missionary. As my friend, Dr. Bleek, informs me, the chief and the tribe, at whose kraal, in company with a member of the Church Missionary party, a Catechist, he has been lately spending three months, received them with open hearts, and entered readily into the freest converse upon all manner of subjects, religion among the rest; till, on one unfortunate day, their messenger returned with their weekly supplies from D'Urban, and mentioned what he had there heard, that one of them was an *Umfundisi.* From that moment all cordiality was at an end. The Kafirs were civil and obliging as before. But they now no longer mingled with their guests in free and friendly converse. Their ears were stopped against the entrance of the Truth; their hearts were prejudiced against it. The old chief said that he had lost one of his wives already, who had became a convert, and left him for a neighboring Missionary Station, and there lived in entire separation from him, though she occasionally came with her children to visit him. He wished to lose no more; and, as he gazed with all a father's pride and affection upon the children, when they were brought to see him, it was easy enough to mark that a true human heart was beating in his bosom.

But in this case we have the wife separating from her husband. Is there any instance known, in the experience of any of our Missionaries, where a man has put away his wives, retaining only one, *and the arrangement has prospered?* I am most anxious to gather true facts to illustrate this matter. And I would repeat again the question, soliciting the kind and serious attention of the Missionaries of this district to it, "Can they furnish me with any statements of facts upon this matter—facts to be relied on—facts to be thoroughly probed and sifted—which will tend to show that the practice hitherto pursued has led to a successful issue in any one single instance? And can they show none to the contrary?"

It is a curious question too, and one, I imagine, attended with no little difficulty, to ask, on what principle the wives are to be put away?

I have heard of Missionaries deciding this matter in each case according to the circumstances; and, in one instance, recommending the man to choose to retain that wife who was the weakest and least able to take care of herself! But, I suppose, generally some rule or other would be laid down for this purpose.

Is, then, the first-married always to be retained, and the others dismissed, including, most commonly, the chief wife of the kraal? And supposing the oldest wife has *no* children, and the second eight or ten? Or supposing the oldest wife to continue a heathen, and the second to become a Christian, yet both to desire to abide with the husband? What then must be done? Is the heathen wife to be retained, because she is the only lawfully married one, and the Christian put away?

But the truth is, as I make bold to believe, that there is not an instance to be produced, in all the experience of the Missionaries of Natal—American, Wesleyan, or Lutheran—of a man being brought to profess Christianity, who, before his conversion, was a polygamist *on any large scale*, and who has accordingly submitted to the authority of his teacher, and put away all his wives but one. There may possibly be a case or two produced of a man with *two* wives, who may have been induced, by the urgent representations of the Missionary and severe denunciations of the Displeasure, to put away one of them; and I venture to say that if the truth were told, there would be, in every such case, some piteous tale of "wrong," like that of the Kafir woman, whose words I have above quoted. But has any man with three, four, or more wives, consented to this practice? In other words, has any *chief* man of the district, in his maturer years, become a Christian?

I feel sure that the reply must be in the negative; and I will answer at once the thought, which may perhaps suggest itself—"Have any of the Pharisees or Chief Priests believed in Him?—by saying that these are not either Pharisees or Chief Priests, but many of them simple, honest, manly, true-hearted men, who, with their people, are not unwilling to hear the Gospel message, and to be instructed in the Truths of Christianity—who already practice many of its precepts, and practiced them in their native kraals, long before they heard them from us, or, perhaps, saw the contradiction of them in the habits of demoralized white men. They are men shrewd, intelligent, inquiring; but they dread any closer contact with Christianity, which is to tear up at once their families, rend asunder the dearest ties which connect them with one another, and fill their whole tribe with anarchy and confusion.

Have the Missionaries ever duly considered this—the effect, I mean, which the reception of the Gospel, *on any large scale*, among this people, and the carrying out of their rule, would produce on the *order* of the colony, when every kraal and every hut, almost, would be the scene of some enforced separation, and of the hideous consequences that must follow, where so many married women, released from the law of their husbands and the strict discipline of their native customs—with their best feelings outraged, and their passions inflamed, themselves and their children branded, in their people's eyes, with a name of dishonor—are turned loose upon their tribes?

It is a very different thing to gather a few youths around a Missionary Station, or to pick up a few impoverished adults, and marry the former decently, and keep the latter in the proper state of single matrimony, to which, in the first instance, most probably, their own necessities, and not their own will and choice, consigned them. By all means let this be done. But what have our Missionaries—good, and excellent, and devoted men, as we know them to be—what have they yet done, to make so much as an *indent* into the huge mass of heathenism with which the land is filled? Nothing—comparatively nothing.

Nor do I believe there will be anything done effectively to this end, until a system is adopted more in accordance with the true spirit of Christianity, and the example of the Apostles themselves. If I am asked to say plainly what I desire, and, as far as I have any influence and power, intend, by God's grace to do in this matter, I say then plainly, *not* to require the putting away of wives by natives, married previously to the reception of Christianity. As I have stated before, I *dare* not do so: I dare not even recommend it to any man. If the unbelieving wife *wishes* to depart from her husband, so be it. But if not, I am bound to tell him that it is his DUTY to *keep* her, and to *cherish her as his wife*, until "death parts them."

Instead of opening Missionary Stations as refuges for the disorderly and discontented, it is my intention to send Missionaries direct to the heathen kraals, first to acquire the language and become familiar with the habits of the people, and then to settle permanently, and live and labor in the midst of them. Of course, we shall require a central Station, where different operations may be carried on, such as are detailed in my Journal; where a native village may by degrees be formed of a higher class, from among the most promising and willing converts in different parts of the country; and where superior schools may be conducted, with a view of training native teachers. But I am persuaded that the main work of converting the natives is to be attempted, and by God's help and blessing accomplished, only by establishing schools and schoolmasters in direct connection with the native villages—some five or six, or perhaps ten, of which may be placed under the supervision of each Missionary Clergyman. And the first step I would take towards introducing such schools and securing the favor of the chiefs towards them, would be to assure them most positively that we do not intend to interfere with their married life, as already constituted—that we do not think it necessary, nor in accordance with God's Will and the demands of our holy religion, to require them to signalize their acceptance of Christianity by a direct act of perfidy and wrong.

At the same time, I, for one, shall sincerely rejoice, if the Government comes to the aid of Religion in this matter; and, by fixing a heavy fine upon a second and every additional marriage, makes it economically undesirable for the natives to contract them. And, in fact, some change in the present native tax-system seems to be required. The hut-tax, when first introduced, was, doubtless, the very best that could have been devised, for bringing the Kafirs easily under

the operations of Government. The huts could be readily counted, and the tax duly enforced. By this time the people have learned, in some measure, to appreciate the meaning of taxation. They growl, indeed, now and then, at the taxes; but this, perhaps, is only a mark of *progress*— a sign that they are approaching towards the character of a thorough home-bred Englishman.

Upon the whole I believe it to be true, that the natives are quite satisfied as to the right of Government to lay taxes on them, in return for the protection they receive, and are as willing as we could expect them to be, to pay them. But, all this time, the peculiar nature of this tax has been tending to work a great evil among them, which is already a serious one, and is every year becoming worse. The tax, being a *hut*-tax, not a *head*-tax, has naturally led to their crowding as many people as they can into one hut; and the consequences, both as regards health and morality, are likely to be very injurious, if this practice be any longer continued. Would it not be possible now, when every kraal is known and registered, and the Kafirs are become used to taxation, to the visits of tax-gatherers, and the interference of the Government in their village affairs, to change the tax of 7s. per hut into one of 2s. per head, and for this purpose to require the *registration* of the whole people? Then how easy would it be to give a death-blow to the practice of polygamy, by exacting a payment (say) of £10 for each marriage after the first, and laying an additional tax (say of 10s. or £1) on the hut of each additional wife? Such a law, however, should on no account be *retrospective* in its bearing.

I believe that such a measure, with the efforts of Christian Teachers, stationed amidst the heathen kraals in the different parts of the land, would by the grace of God, avail abundantly—and that, at no distant time—to the putting down of the practice of polygamy, and so assist towards the deliverance of this people from the powers of Satan into the Kingdom of our Lord. I know of course, that in the case of adult Kafirs, thoroughly seasoned in the habits of their nation, it were idle to expect that perfect and entire change of character and practice, which some seem to require in them. I do not look for this, nor desire to pour all at once, into these old bottles, the new wine of highly refined European Christianity, purified during the lapse of ages of deep thought, of ceaseless agitation, of holy deeds, and lessons, and prayers. But I do humbly trust, that by the blessing of Almighty God upon our labors, we may be enabled to be instruments of great good in His hand towards this people; and not to these only—but to the wretched refugees, who flock to this Christian land for shelter from the spear of their destroyer, and to the multitude of dark souls beyond them.

And here I might close, but for the astonishing fact that, in this our day, in this our present state of Christian feeling, a public journalist can be found to indite, and set forward in print the proposal, that "the refugees should be given up!" Yes, fellow-Englishmen! we are to sacrifice the honor of our great Name, and the glory of making English soil, wherever it can be found, the place of freedom for the

slave, the home for the sorrowful and the oppressed! Yes, fellow Christians! we are to drive back into the hands of their tyrant the poor wretches whom God brings to our feet in the hour of utter distress, bidding us, by the plain Voice of His Providence, to raise them from their misery, that they may share with us the hopes and privileges of British subjects and of Christian men! O shame on the unmanly thought! Let it never be said again that English Christians, the Christians of Natal, could so much as hear the thing named, without a feeling of revulsion and abhorrence. Once, indeed, it was true of the white inhabitants of Natal, that they acted the part of calculating, selfish cowards, instead of brave, Christian men; and made a treaty with Dingaan to give up all future refugees. And they actually did send back six wretched fugitives into the hands of the tyrant, though with the certainty, as Capt. Gardiner tells us, "that they would be knocked on the head with knob-kirries and be impaled."*

* See the whole details narrated, with astonishing simplicity, by Captain Gardiner himself, in his Travels, pp. 145–186. The refugees consisted of six persons, a female chieftain, a male and female servant, and three girls, children of the latter. The adults had been surrendered first, and were taken back by Capt. Gardiner himself, who interceded for them in vain: they were doomed to be "starved to death;" but after a few days were knocked upon the head. The King, however, required the children also, and Capt. Gardiner returned to secure them. I quote the last portion of his narrative.

"It appears that the apprehension of the remainder of Nonka's party had occasioned much trouble, the whole of the whites and about sixty of the natives having been obliged to proceed in a body to enforce the requisition. The people of the village where they had been staying, rescued them from two Englishmen and a Hottentot, who had taken them in their absence; they waylaid them, and issuing from the woods as they passed, contrived while in conversation, but without using force, to effect their purpose. On this the large party before mentioned proceeded to the spot, but the natives, alarmed at their numbers, fled to a neighboring hill. Thus posted, Mr. Cane, with two natives, volunteered to communicate with them. He went up in a firm manner and remonstrated with them, at the same time assuring them that, unless the persons in question were delivered up by sunset, he would instantly shoot the Umzana to whom he addressed himself. Happily, no further effort was made, and the three girls were secured. But here another heart-rending scene took place. Umfazaguatu (the Umzana) was related to the children, and evinced feelings of which humanity might boast. Suddenly casting away his assegais, he threw himself upon the ground in a supplicating posture, and only implored that he might be bound and sent to Dingaan in lieu of the prisoners. This, of course, could not be permitted, though all must doubtless have felt the painful necessity of acting with so much apparent rigor. On my arrival, I found them in one of my huts, in charge of two men who had been sent for the purpose from Congella. On their leaving this morning, I sent on my own responsibility the following message to Dingaan, well knowing that it would express the sentiments of every European at Port Natal:—"If deserters must be killed, let them be killed at once; but, if they are to be starved to death, we are resolved that not another individual shall be sent back." The men promised to be kind to the prisoners by the way, and on no account to mention the fate which would probably await them on their arrival. My heart sickens at the thought of such barbarities. Still it is a duty we owe to the two thousand natives now residing here, and who, together with ourselves, would all some night have probably been immolated, but for the security of the present treaty."

In spite of these fears, and this strong sense of duty, we see there was a point at which the voice of conscience *would* make itself heard upon the side of humanity. But the sophistry of man's heart is great. They might be *killed*—"knocked upon the head," that is, "and impaled"—but must not be "starved to death;" or the settlers would in that case brave resolutely, like men, the tremendous wrath of Dingaan.

Natal, however, was no British colony then; and the whole transaction brought a stain, at the time, in the opinion of his countrymen at home, upon the character of him who acted the chief part in it, which only long years of noble effort since, in the service of his Lord, a life of faith and sufferings, even unto death, endured with a saintly constancy, have sufficed to overpower in our memories. But are such deeds as these to be repeated among us, under the sanction of the Government of Great Britain, and under the same pretext of expediency? Does not the heart of man, woman or child, who reads the piteous story, revolt in horror and disgust from it? Could we bear to stand by, as I suppose we are expected to do, and tamely look on at the repetition of such scenes?

And they *would* be repeated. Who does not know that, after the recent flight of refugees from Panda's territory, some of Panda's own messengers were sent to demand them back? And the following scene is said to have occurred on the occasion, in the presence of Mr. Shepstone. Confronted with the chief leader of the refugees, who was one of Panda's great officers, these messengers urged upon him his duty to return, his Master's *love* for him, and the breaking of the Chief's heart for the loss of so dear a servant. He heard them silently—seated, as usual, upon the ground, and wrapped in the folds of his blanket. When all had done, having mingled with their arguments the most solemn protestations, in their master's name, of safety for him in life and property, if he would but return, the chief sat upright, and, throwing back his covering, laid bare his manly breast, and gave his arms free play for his address. Then, looking at them, one by one, he said:—"I know you all; you are all my companions—my friends. You are—, and you are—, and you are—, and you are. And you all know *me*. You know what my wealth and my power *was*, in the Zulu land: and you see what I am now—a beggar! And yet you ask me to return—you, who know there is not one of you, that would not joyfully change places with me, if you could but do what I have done, and bring your wives and children safe across the river. But here I am—and here I will remain. You tell me I shall be safe, if I return: you know I shall be killed. Did you ever know a man like me go back and live?" They mentioned two or three. "Yes! they were poor men. But did you ever know a chief who did so?" They gave the name of *one*. "Yes! he had been many years away, and he went back at last of his own free-will. But, you know my death is doomed. I have made my choice. I will not go back."

Some of these very messengers had wives among the refugees, and claimed them, and were told to take them, if they could by fair means. They did try to take them, but were not allowed to use the extremity of force. Yet for many yards they dragged them, shrieking and crying, "You may kill us now—here now—but not there." For hours this struggle continued, all manner of argument and persuasion being used to induce them to return—but all to no purpose. Their reply was still the same—"Kill us here, but not there."

But a most touching incident is connected with one of these very

messengers. He knows that he is doomed; his death-warrant is gone forth. It will be in his case as in that of others, whose death by Panda's orders was thus described to Mr. Shepstone by one of the refugees, comparing the mode of execution, pursued by the present Chief, with the measures of his predecessors, Chaka and Dingaan: "The Chief will send out his messengers; they will come to his kraal; they will enter his hut; they will eat and drink with him and his people; and then, when all will be peace and quietness, and they fear no evil, while his meat is yet in their mouths, they will spring upon their feet and stab him. His life-blood will reach the door of his hut, before any one can creep out of it." This hut-scene will be transacted so soon as he returns; or, rather, as soon as the waters of the Tugela are up, and the despot has his people more completely in his power. And yet the man determined to return. His wives and his little ones are there. Poor polygamist as he is, he cannot stay here—here, where he *might* have stayed in peace and safety—and leave them behind. It will be interesting to know his fate.

But, happily, we have a Government, both here and at home, which would never hear of such a proposal as that of surrendering the refugees. Indeed, it would be *impossible* to enforce such surrenders, along the banks of such a stream as the Tugela, or to recover, from every kraal within the district, the fugitives who might escape from time to time, and mingle with their brethren. And were it possible, who does not see that deep and fearful indeed would be the hatred that would inevitably be excited in the breasts of our own Kafirs by the perpetration of such acts of inhumanity upon their own friends and relatives? No! the thing could not be seriously thought of for one moment. If it were, assuredly the voice of a British Parliament would be heard, and all England would cry against it. Doubtless, judicious measures are required for dealing with this question, and providing properly for the reception and safe government of these refugees. And this, of course, we may believe has been under the consideration of our Government, and will be not the least weighty of the many weighty matters that will be laid before his Excellency Sir George Grey, on his arrival.

Meanwhile, thank God, the great laws of our own dear mother-land are maintained in this colony, so far, at least, as to recognize the principle that the person of every man who sets his foot on British soil is safe from the dread of his oppressor. We do not, indeed, secure to him the property he brings with him. We send back all the cattle of the refugees to Panda. We leave the greatest chief among them, to begin his new life, in this land of his choice, a free man, but a beggar. And this, perhaps, could not be otherwise. It would be difficult to prove that the cattle he brought with him were his own, and not the property of his master. And they care not for this sacrifice. It is life, dear life, they crave for themselves and for those they love.

But, forsooth, the refugees must be given up, because "no tenderness for *them* requires us to sacrifice *ourselves*"—because "our own safety is the first law!" So said the Priest and Levite, as they hasted

along that "bloody way," and feared that the assassins who had waylaid the poor traveller, might return to rob and murder themselves. But so thought not the good Samaritan, nor the gracious Lord, who said to us by His word, and infinitely more by his blessed example, "Go, thou, and do likewise." Our own safety! And are we to do this base deed, and dishonor our country's name, in the sight of all the world, with the craven hope of saving our own pitiful lives, when, for the honor of that great name, involved in the defence of a weak but righteous cause, we have seen, as it were, before our very eyes, a hundred thousand noble Englishmen—noble, many of them in rank and station, but all in spirit—go cheerfully forth from all they held dear on earth, and leave their bones upon the bloody Crimean fields! Our own safety! But can that be secured, if there be a living God, who judges the world, by such an expedient as this? Are we not sure that our safety can only be secured by doing our duty, in the sight of God and man, and that if we depart from this, the wisest schemes of human policy will come to nought—will be found but folly in the end, wanting in something on which the whole hope of success would depend, and our fancied security turn out to be a miserable delusion? I verily believe God's curse would light upon us, and upon our doings in this land, if this were to be one of them.

For, did the Great King send us here, that we should only, or chiefly, think of securing our own safety? Did He plant the English flag on this soil merely that we might live at our ease, and get gain of gold, and barter for beads with the wretched tribes of South Africa? Did He not send us here to do His work—to proclaim His name of love among this people—to tell them of their Saviour and Lord, and advance His kingdom among them? Is not this the great end—*the one sole end*—for which the British Empire has been reared, and for which her colonies encircle the globe? Do we not, at least, as Christians, profess to believe this? If we endeavor to do God's will with all our hearts, as I trust we shall, I doubt not the blessing of the Almighty will be with us, and the Prince of Peace himself will shield us. If we have faith in God we shall be able, in his own good time, to remove the mountains of difficulty which now seem to stand between us and our hope. But if *not*—if we have no such faith in the power of Christ's name, in the presence of God's Spirit, in the promise of His help and blessing—then better far were it for England to give up this goodly portion of God's earth, which she cannot hold for his glory, to give it up once more into the hands of the savage, or rather into the hands of those good men and true, the Christian Missionaries of every kind, who will stake their lives upon the Word of their Lord, and count it their highest joy to spend and be spent in His service. Such as these, I doubt not, are to be found. There are those here now, who have braved already the dangers of savage life in the wilderness, and who would not forsake this land, which they have seized for Christ, till, by God's grace, they have subdued it, and "made the wilderness to blossom as the rose."